This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600088193Z

The Case Stated was by Charles Leslie, 1713.
William Darrell, S.J., who died at St. Omer's
1721, was the author (according to Dr.
Oliver) of The Case Reviewed, which
happened through 3 editions.
Other books on this controversy are referred
to on p. iii. of this volume.

HG.

THE CASE STATED

between the

CHURCH of ROME

and the

CHURCH of ENGLAND

in a

SECOND CONVERSATION

betwixt a

ROMAN CATHOLICK LORD,

and a

GENTLEMAN of the CHURCH of *ENGLAND.*

IN TWO PARTS.

Be ready always to give an Answer to every Man, that asketh you a Reason of the Hope, that is in you.
1. Pet. 3. ℣. 15.

Printed Anno 1721.

130. f. 116.

H.J. 8 Apr. 1861.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

Containing ſome neceſſary Inſtructions relating to the Method obſerved in this ſecond Converſation: *as likewiſe ſome Remarks upon the* Gentleman's *unfair Dealing in the* former.

THE *Caſe ſtated* has of late Years been a celebrated Title. For it has already appear'd at the Head of four or five Editions of the ſame Book, and ſeveral Changes have been rung upon it. As *Caſe reſtated*, *Caſe truly ſtated*, *Caſe farther ſtated*, *&c.* But as Men, when they have gone round the whole Circle of new Fashions, return many Times to the old Mode, ſo I judg'd it beſt to reſume the old plain Title of *Caſe ſtated*: *Firſt*, becauſe the two *Churches*, and *Diſputants* concern'd in this *ſecond Converſation* are the very ſame they were in the former. 2*dly*, becauſe not only the Subject of their Diſcourſe, but the very Order and Diſpoſition of it is ſtill the ſame. And 3*dly*, becauſe the *Gentleman* having here full Liberty to repeat every

Thing he ſaid in the *former Converſation*, if the Caſe of the *Church of England*, whoſe Advocate he is, be there fairly ſtated by him, I am ſure that of the *Church of Rome* (which is moſt shamefully miſrepreſented in that Converſation) is now fairly ſtated by his *Lordship* in this. And ſo I hope every Thing will fully anſwer the Title, I have choſen.

Some will perhaps tell me, I have taken a great Deal of Pains to no Purpoſe, ſince the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated* (as I shall always call it to diſtinguish it from this) has already been ſufficiently anſwer'd, particularly by the learned Author of the *Church of Chriſt shew'd, &c.* and many will be apt to think we ſet too great a Value upon the *Gentleman's* Performance by Anſwering it ſo often. But for my Part I can ſee no ſolid Reaſon why a Book should be valued the more for having been often confuted; and all that can be inferr'd from it is, that there are more than one of Opinion, that the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated* is very much overrated by thoſe, who cry it up for an unanſwerable Piece. I own it is already ſufficiently anſwer'd by the forementioned Author, and even more than ſufficiently. For his Book may properly be call'd a Magazine of Erudition; where Plenty of all Sorts of controverſial Arms both offenſive and defenſive is laid up. But to many 'tis as a Treaſure lock'd up, and to theſe my Anſwer will ſerve as a key to let them into it. So that I ſtick not to own here very frankly without Fear of being call'd a *Plagiary*, that I have borrow'd many of my choiceſt Materials of him, and it has been my principal Buſineſs to put them together in ſuch a Manner, as I judg'd would be beſt accommodated to the Capacity of thoſe, whoſe Inſtruction I have principally in View.

But I had other Reaſons to induce me to undertake this Work: and that particularly by Way of Dialogue betwixt the ſame Perſons; 1. to convince the *Gentleman* (if it be poſſible) that *Idiot*, and *Popiſh Lord* are not ſynonimous Terms, as he ſeems to ſuppoſe in the whole Courſe of his Dialogue, in which his *Popiſh Lord* perſonates the *Dunce* to the Life. Nay his *Lordſhip* ſeems to be brought upon the Stage only to be laugh'd at, and ſet off the imaginary Triumphs of his Adverſary. 2. Becauſe the Way of Dialogue is certainly the moſt eaſy and familiar Way of Conveying Truths to Vulgar Capacities, and even the faireſt Way, provided no Partiality be uſed to the Prejudice of either Side, and each Diſputant be allow'd to ſay as much for his Cauſe, as it will fairly bear. All which the Reader will find in this Converſation, wherein the *Gentleman* delivers his own Senſe as he did before, and his *Lordſhip* is no longer under the Tutelage of his *Proteſtant* Maſter.

This inclines me to think, that tho the *Gentleman's* Book had been anſwer'd by more Hands than it has, it would be no Objection againſt this Anſwer of mine by Reaſon of the Newneſs as well as Uſefulneſs of it's Method. For it preſents the Reader with *two Books* in one. When he reads the *Gentleman's* Part in this Converſation, it will be the ſame as if he had that Author's own Book before him: And when he reads his *Lordſhip's* Anſwer to him, as he now ſpeaks the true Senſe of his Church, it may come to put him in Mind of an old uſeful Proverb, Viz. *that one Story is good till the other be told.* In a Word, the Method I have confined myſelf to, ſeems to have it's peculiar Advantage in putting me under a Neceſſity not only to lead the

Reader in an eaſy and familiar Way through all the Parts of Controverſy, but to do it in ſuch a Manner, as cannot but have the Approbation of *both Churches*. Becauſe the *Proteſtant* as well as *Catholick* Reader will here find the whole Cauſe of Religion fairly pleaded by one of his own Communion. So that neither of the contending Parties will be accuſed of Partiality, or of Wronging his Adverſary by making him ſpeak Things, which he may juſtly diſown.

But *3dly*, I was induced to undertake this Task, becauſe there is a large Difference between Anſwering a Book in the Lump, and doing it in a Manner Word for Word. The firſt is indeed the common Way, and (provided there be no wilful Omiſſion of any Thing of Moment) ſuffices undoubtedly to ſatisfy thoſe, who are content with a reaſonable Satisfaction. But it ſeems our *Proteſtant* Adverſaries will not be content with this. All their *Geeſe are Swans*, and every Thing they write, tho it be never ſo trivial in itſelf, is immediately magnified into an unanſwerable Piece, if any one thinks it not worth the Trouble of an Anſwer.

I ſhall give a remarkable Inſtance of this my Obſervation. The *Gentleman* begins his *Caſe ſtated* with theſe introductory Queſtions. *Pray, My Lord, what is there in the Communion of the Church of England ſhould make you think your Soul in Danger? Would there be any Hazard of your Soul, if there were no Invocation of Saints that are Dead in the publick Offices of the Church? No Pictures or Images of God to be ſeen there? No Elevation of the Hoſt? &c.* Now the *Reſtater*, who began firſt to write againſt the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated*, and intended no more than a brief Anſwer to the moſt material Points, thought thoſe Queſtions too fri-

volous to deſerve his Notice; and I am wholly of his Mind. Nay I do not only think them ſo, but what is more, I have proved them to be frivolous in the *Introduction*, where they are now anſwer'd. Not that they deſerve it, but becauſe the Method, to which I have tied myſelf down, obliged me to it. For otherwiſe it is probable I should have follow'd the Example of my Predeceſſor, and paſs'd them over as not worth an Anſwer.

But the *Vindicator*, who took up the Cudgels for the *Gentleman* againſt the *Reſtater*, crows moſt unmercifully over him for this Omiſſion, which he confidently takes for a tacit Acknowledgment that he could not anſwer them. The Author of the *Caſe farther ſtated* (who I preſume is no ſtranger to the *Vindicator*) do's the ſame. *All this* (ſays he) *the Reſtater paſs'd over in a profound ſilence. He knew the Queſtion was not to be anſwer'd, and was therefore ſo wiſe, as to ſuppreſs it all he could.* pag. 122. and again. *It was an unlucky Difficulty ſtarted, and ſince it cannot otherwiſe be got over, it was neceſſary to throw it aſide, and ſay nothing of it: And we muſt therefore not be ſo unreaſonable as to expect an Anſwer, where it is not to be had.* Ibid. I am really ſorry this worthy Gentleman has thus expoſed himſelf in Print. For what a Rout is here about a Trifle! Which muſt by all Means be adopted into the Catalogue of *Proteſtant Unanſwerables* to repair the Affront put upon it by a *Papiſt*, who ſlighted it as a Thing beneath his Notice. How great Wits will ſometimes overſhoot themſelves!

But let that be as it will, it is manifeſt, that tho a Book be ſufficiently anſwer'd, there may ſtill be Room left for a farther Anſwer to it: not to ſupply any real Defects of former Anſwers, but to ſilence the unreaſonable Clamours of thoſe, who ſet

a Value upon every inſignifiant Objection, and cry it up for *unanſwerable*, meerly becauſe it is not anſwer'd. Now the Method I have obliged myſelf to, permits me not to omit Things, which others, who only anſwer the *Gentleman* in the Lump, may legally paſs over without any unfair Dealing, or Deſerving the ſevere Reflections made by the *Vindicator*, or his *alter idem*, the Author of the *Caſe farther ſtated*.

I flatter myſelf over and above, that my Anſwer will have it's peculiar Advantage in this Reſpect, *viz.* becauſe it not only contains all the uſual Queſtions in Diſpute between us and *Proteſtants*, but likewiſe ſeveral odd Subjects, which being out of the common Road are not uſually treated by other Controvertiſts; and tho the Objections relating to theſe Subjects be not material in themſelves, they have for the moſt Part as powerful an influence upon weak Minds, and Vulgar Capacities, as Arguments of the greateſt Weight.

But, tho I have obliged myſelf, as I have already acquainted the Reader, to follow my Adverſary Step by Step, whenever it was poſſible to make him repeat his own Words with any Manner of Connection, yet I was forced ſometimes to recede a little from the Rigour of this Method, which happens only when the *Gentleman* in his *Caſe ſtated* undertakes to confute either with ſerious Arguments or ſome fine Drollery the Nonſenſe his *Lordship* has utter'd; That is, when his Anſwer contains nothing, but a Confutation of that Nonſenſe. In which Caſe it was impoſſible to repeat the *Gentleman's* Words without Repeating the Blunder, to which they are a direct Anſwer. And 'tis only in ſuch Occaſions that any Thing of the *Gentleman's*

man's Part in his *Caſe ſtated* is omitted in this Converſation. And even then it is ſupplied by an *Advertiſement*, which directs the Reader to the Page of the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated*, where it may be found.

I have likewiſe been obliged for the Sake of Connection and Clearneſs to make the *Gentleman* ſpeak many Things in this ſecond Converſation, which are not to be found in the former. But to convince the Reader how far I am from Imitating the Example of my Adverſary, that is, from making him ſay any Thing he may juſtly diſown, or be aſhamed of, I can confidently aſſure him, that the weakeſt Things the *Gentleman* ſays throughout this whole Converſation, are all Goods *of his own Importing*. And therefore leaſt the one ſhould be miſtaken for the other, whatever belong here to the *Gentleman's* Part as taken from his own *Caſe ſtated* has this Mark [»] ſet before every Line of it, with the *Page* quoted, from whence it is taken: which Mark is wholly omitted, when I dictate to him.

Very little indeed will be found here of his *Lordship's* Part in the *former Converſation*: becauſe he was ſeldom allow'd to ſpeak Senſe. 'Twas this gave me the greateſt Difficulty, and almoſt diſhearten'd me from Purſuing my Reſolution of Anſwering it as I now do in the way of Dialogue between the ſame two Perſons. For, tho this way of writing be the eaſieſt imaginable, when the Author is at full Liberty to dictate to both Parties as he pleaſes, nothing on the contrary was more puzling to me, who was obliged to repeat whatever the *Gentleman* ſpoke, yet could ſeldom repeat any Thing his *Lordship* had ſaid

in the former Converſation; for if I did, I adopted the Blunders and Nonſenſe, I have undertaken to correct; and without it I ſaw no Poſſibility of Introducing the *Gentleman's* Anſwers with the Order and Connection, which the Nature of Dialogues indiſpenſably requires: And tho I have made a Shift to do it much oftner, than I thought I could at my firſt Setting out, I was forced to leave *Gaps* here and there, and fill them up for the Sake of Connection with ſhort *Advertiſement* to the Reader; as likewiſe to apologize in the ſame Manner for the aforeſaid few Omiſſions of Pieces, which could not poſſibly be brought into this Converſation.

I muſt farther acquaint the Reader, that when the *Gentleman* in his *Caſe ſtated* is ſomewhat long in his Harangues, which often contain a Heap of Arguments huddled together in a very confuſed Manner, I have made bold to parcel them out into ſeveral Heads by frequent Interruptions. *Firſt*, to put it out of my Power to overlook any Thing that is material, and *2dly*, to place my Anſwers as near as was poſſible to the reſpective Objections they belong to; and ſo ſave the Reader from being either loſt in a Labyrinth, or obliged to look back every Moment to refreſh his Memory. All which are unqueſtionable Proofs, that I have aim'd at nothing more than to ſet every Thing in the cleareſt Light.

His *Lordſhip* being ſuppoſed to be a *Layman*, it was not natural to make him ſpeak like a Schoolman or profound *Divine*. For which Reaſon the Reader will be troubled as little as is poſſible with the learned Languages of Schools, nor with any more Quotations, than are abſolutely neceſſary for

his *Lordship* to maintain his Cauſe. The Truth of the Matter is, I preſume not to write for Schollars, but the Generality of Laymen, and have therefore made it my Study to expreſs myſelf ſo intelligibly, that tho perhaps I may not be always underſtood by the moſt ignorant of all, the middle Sort between a *Scholler* and a *Plowman*, if bleſſed with a good natural Capacity, will eaſily underſtand me.

The Motive, that induced me thus to accommodate myſelf, as much as was poſſible to the Capacity of the unlearned, was to provide a proper Antidote for thoſe, who are moſt in Danger of being poiſon'd by the *Gentleman's* artful Way of Impoſing upon his Reader by crafty *Inſinuations*, pleaſant *Railleries*, deceitful *Equivocations*, *Miſrepreſentations* without Number, and *Falſehoods* as boldly aſſerted, as if they were *reveal'd Truths*. For tho the learned, who ſearch into the Bottom of Things, and can diſcern Froth and Noiſe from ſolid Arguments, be proof againſt theſe little Artifices, yet they are apt to have an Influence on thoſe, who either know nothing of the true State of the Queſtion, or are not skilful enough of themſelves to diſtinguish between *Sophiſtry* and *fair Reaſoning*, and are often more affected with a *quaint Turn*, a *bold Aſſertion*, or *pleaſant Banter*, than the ſtrongeſt Demonſtration.

We cannot doubt but the *Gentleman* has cook'd his *Caſe ſtated* to pleaſe theſe Palates; and I muſt do him the Juſtice to own he has done it with the moſt exquiſite Skill. I ſhall preſent the Reader with a few Samples of it to let him ſee how great an Artiſt he is at *ſtating Caſes*.

1. The weak Part he allots to his *Roman Catho-*

lick Lord is a continued Cheat upon his unlearned Readers from End to End. For unleſs he will chooſe to plead Ignorance (which is a very bad Excuſe for a *Divine*) he could have no other End in it than to make his Readers believe, that *Roman Catholicks* have nothing better to ſay for their Religion, than what his *Lordſhip* ſays for it in the *former Converſation*. Which certainly is a Piece of Diſingenuity wholly unbecoming a fair Adverſary.

2. He ſhews himſelf moſt exquiſitly ſkilful at Puzling and Perplexing a Cauſe by Mixing Truth and Falſehood ſo artfully together, that you can neither grant all without Prejudice to your Cauſe, nor deny all without Wronging the Truth. The Uſe of this is to lead ignorant People into a Miſt, and keep out of Sight the true State of the Queſtion.

3. No Man is ſo profuſe in *Scripture-Texts*, as the *Gentleman* in certain Occaſions, when he has a Thing to ſet forth, which either is quite foreign to the Purpoſe, or never was denied by any *Roman Catholick*. And what can be the Deſign of this? There certainly lies a Snake in the Graſs. For ignorant People will never imagine the *Gentleman* would produce ſo much *good Scripture* but to confute ſome *papiſtical Error*. And will they not then take us to be very worſt of Chriſtians, ſince they will ſuppoſe us to deny Things ſo plainly proved from *Scripture*, and conclude the *Proteſtant Gentleman* has the whole Truth of the Queſtion of his Side?

4. The *Gentleman* is extremely fond of *Repetitions*, which, as he has managed them, turn to a very good Account. But where is the Harm of it? Can Truth be told too often? No, but Falſehood may: and there is a large Difference between *Saying* and

Proving. Now when the *Gentleman* has once ſaid a Thing (which afterwards he commonly calls *Shewing* or *Proving*) and the *noble Peer* has ſaid nothing to diſprove it, he reckons upon it after that as ſo much Ground fairly gain'd upon the *Church of Rome*, and repeats it upon all Occaſions as a Thing not to be conteſted with him any more than a firſt Principle: not Doubting but his *Proteſtant* Readers will regard him as one in a *Triumph* rather than *Diſpute*: Nor has he any Reaſon to fear many of them will be ſagacious enough to reflect, that his *Popiſh Lord* is all the while under Tutelage, and can go no farther than the Length of his leading Strings, which the *Gentleman* keeps faſt in his own Hands, will permit him.

5. As to *Equivocations*, the *Gentleman* has managed them with the utmoſt Dexterity. There are three Choice ones, of which he has made a very good Hand in the Diſputes about *Infallibility*, *Invocation of Saints*, and the Honour we pay to their *Images* and *Reliques*. His double Meaning of the CHURCH OF ROME, which he takes ſometimes for the *whole Church in Communion with the See of Rome*, and very often for the particular *Dioceſs of Rome* is very uſeful to him in the Queſtion of *Infallibility*. For who can refuſe to be of the *Gentleman's* Opinion, that it is no Article of Faith, that *Infallibility* was ever promiſed to one particular Dioceſs more than another?

His two other favourite Equivocations are grounded on the various Acceptations of the words WORSHIP, and MEANS OF GRACE; the ambiguous Meaning whereof he found to be of excellent Uſe for the Ridiculing of *Miracles*, *Bleſſings*, *Images*, *Reliques*, *Holy Water*, *&c.* and

to prove *Papiſts* to be *Idolaters* in Spite of common Senſe.

I ſhould be glad I had no Reaſon to complain of *Falſifications*, becauſe the Charge is foul and odious. But, as I have been obliged to make his *Lordſhip* expoſe them, when they fell in his Way; I ſhall here take Notice of one, which indeed is notorious. The Reader will find it in the 8th *Section*, 2d *Part*; the Title whereof is, ST AUSTIN FALSIFIED. It contains a Paſſage taken from that Father upon the 96th *Pſalm*, which, if fairly render'd, bears a Senſe wholly different from what the *Gentleman* has fix'd upon it by the moſt unfaithful Tranſlation, that perhaps ever ventured to appear in Print; And, what is very remarkable, he repeats it four or five Times afterwards, and lays a ſingular Streſs upon it to prove the Unlawfulneſs of our *Invocation of Saints and Angels*. However I am inclined to think the *Gentleman* is rather the Copier, than primary Author of the ſcandalous Falſification I ſpeak of; it being very probable he found it in the Writings of his *Proteſtant* Predeceſſors, and took it upon Truſt either through Want of Leiſure to examine it himſelf, or too good an Opinion of the Authors, from whom he tranſcribed it. This is the moſt favourable Conſtruction I can put upon this, and other unfaithful Quotations, that will be hereafter laid to his Charge.

But I cannot make the ſame Apology for ſome notorious *Untruths*, and *Calumnies* ſcatter'd up and down in the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated*. Becauſe there was no Need of a tedious Search into Authors to detect the Falſehood of theſe. The Dictates of his his own Conſcience and Reaſon ſufficed alone to

convince him of it: and he is equally inexcuſable, whether he be the *Forger*, or *Diſperſer* only of ſuch Slanders: I ſhall here mention only two. *Firſt*, that *the Scriptures and Legends have the ſame Foundation in the Church of Rome; that is, her Authority: and that therefore the common People believe them both alike, and the Men of Senſe believe neither.* pag. 159. and 2dly, that *the Pope's Supremacy is the only Article in our Creed to be believed explicitly. As for others, implicite will do for them all, that is, it is no Matter, whether we believe them or not.* pag. 197.

Is it poſſible a Perſon of the *Gentleman's* Judgment and Learning believed a Word of this, when he wrote it? If he did, it is a flagrant Inſtance, to what exceſſive Degree Prejudice will blind a Man. If not, it ſhews how little Juſtice *Roman Catholicks* can expect from a *Proteſtant* Writer; and ſuffices abundantly to give the Reader a juſt Idea of what the *Gentleman* himſelf thought of the Cauſe, he undertook to plead. For he could not be ignorant of this received maxim, that *Truth ſtands always firm upon it's own Bottom*, and needs not the little Triks of *Sophiſtry*, much leſs the Help of *Falſehood* and *Slander* to ſupport it. If therefore a Perſon of his Capacity durſt not hazard the Iſſue of his Cauſe upon a fair Trial, but found himſelf obliged to have Recourſe to ſuch Artifices, as I am ſure a good Cauſe ſtands not in Need of, muſt we not conclude, he had himſelf an entire Miſtruſt of the Goodneſs of his Cauſe, ſince he effectually Judg'd it ſtood in Need of theſe Artifices, and employ'd them accordingly? I may therefore confidently ſay, that all the unfair and ſiniſter Ways, the *Gentleman* has made Uſe of to aſperſe and traduce the *Church of Rome*, are ſo many authentick Teſtimo-

nies of his own Producing, that the Truth is againſt him.

There is one Thing very remarkable in the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated*. For in the *Title page* of his Book he promiſes to ſhew two Things. 1. *That the Doubt and Danger of Salvation is in the Communion of the Church of Rome.* And 2*dly*, *that the Certainty and Safety is in the Communion of the Church of England.* Now I muſt own he has labour'd hard to prove the former. Nay he has gone much farther. For he has employ'd near 30 pages (I hope it will not do him much Honour) to prove us as rank *Idolaters* as the *Heathens* ever were. And ſo inſtead of *Doubt* and *Danger* of Salvation, he ought to have promiſed to ſhew, that nothing but *Hell* and *Damnation* can be hoped for in the *Church of Rome*; ſince theſe will ſurely be the juſt Reward of *heathen Idolatry* practiſed by *Chriſtians* themſelves.

But as to the latter Point, *viz.* his Shewing *the Certainty and Safety of Salvation in the Church of England*, the *Gentleman* has been pleaſed to ſuperſede that Part of his Task; as Judging it much eaſier to lampoon and traduce the *Church of Rome*, than defend his own. For there is not one ſingle Argument in the *Gentleman's* whole Book to convince the Reader, that the Communion of the *Church of England* is preferable to that of any other *reform'd Church.* And why then is the *Church of England* alone mention'd in the *Title-page* with this pompous Elogium, *that the Certainty and Safety of Salvation is in her Communion.* Will not every one, who reads this Title expect to find ſome poſitive Proofs to convince him that he ought to prefer her Communion before any other? And will he not be ſtrangely diſappointed to find nothing but a meer Satyr

Satyr upon the *Church of Rome*, and not one ſolid Argument to induce him to embrace the *Gentleman's* Church rather than that of *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, *Independents*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Quakers*, *&c.* in Caſe he either has his Religion yet to choſe, or is diſpoſed to leave that, in which he has till then been educated?

If the *Gentleman* had declared that his whole Deſign was to make a *Non-Papiſt* of his *Lordship*, I ſhould have own'd his Book and Title were exactly of a Piece. For I confeſs I never read a more artful Lampoon upon *Popery* in my whole Life. But to make a ſolemn Profeſſion of ſhewing *that the Certainty and Safety of Salvation are in the Communion of the Church of England* without giving one ſingle Reaſon to prove her Communion to be preferable to that of any *diſſenting Proteſtant Church*, or Offering at one *diſtinctive Mark* to ſhew her to be that *One*, *Holy*, *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Church* profeſs'd in the *Nicene Creed*, is ſuch an Omiſſion, as will not eaſily be excuſed.

What! Did he deſign to laugh his *Lordship* out of all *reveal'd Religion?* If ſo, I cannot but approve of the Method he has taken. But if he intended to make him a Convert to the *Church of England* preferably to any other Church, why did he not ſet forth her peculiar Advantages over other *Proteſtant Communions* all differing from one another, to the End that when his *Lordship* ſhould be reſolved to renounce *Popery*, he might not turn *Atheiſt* or *Deiſt* for Want of knowing where to find the true *Church of Chriſt?* Why did he not endeavour to convince him of the *Antiquity* of the *reform'd Church of England*; her *perpetual Viſibility* from the firſt Preaching of the Goſpel in *Great Britain*; her

THE CONTENTS of the firſt Part.

THE Introduction *containing an Anſwer to the Gentleman's preliminary Queſtions.* Pag. 1

§. 1.

Rome *the* Mother-Church. p. 7

§. 2.

St Peter's *Supremacy.* p. 10

§. 3.

Proved from St Mathew. p. 13

§. 4.

Proved from St John. p. 19

§. 5.

Objections againſt St Peter's *Supremacy anſwer'd.* p. 27

§. 6.

The Objection from the Council of Jeruſalem *anſwer'd.* p. 36

§. 7.

Other Objections anſwer'd. p. 41

§. 8.

The Church's Unity, *and* Supremacy *of the Pope.* p. 46

§. 9.

St Gregory's *Judgment relating to the Subject under Debate.* p. 50

§. 10.

St Cyprian's *Judgment relating to the ſame Subject.* p. 55

§. 11.

The Belief of common Chriſtianity *is not a ſufficient* Unity of Faith. p. 58

§. 12.

The Supremacy *reſumed with a Touch upon* Unity. p. 64

§. 13.

Of new Articles *of Faith, and the* Sacraments. p. 69

§. 14.

Of Sects *and* Diviſions. p. 75

§. 15.

The Greek Church *broke off from the* Church of Rome. p. 72

§. 16.

The Greek Church *formely own'd the* Pope's Supremacy. p. 82

§. 17.

'Tis a notorious Falſehood, that the Church in Communion with the See of Rome *never was one Half of the* great Body of Chriſtians *in the* World. p. 86

§. 18.

Mr Du Pin *explain'd.* p. 92

§. 19.

Mr Talon's *Speech againſt* Innocent *XI. falſely quoted by the* Gentleman. p. 96

§. 20.

Of general Councils. p. 100

§. 21.

A general Council is the Repreſentative of the Catholick Church *only.* p. 109

§. 22.
The Infallibility *of the Church.* p. 114

§. 23.
All God's Promises are not Conditional. p. 120

§. 24.
The Church always Visible *and* Holy. p. 127

§. 25.
Of Miracles. p. 134

§. 26.
The Circle *examined.* p. 142

§. 27.
The Being *of a* God *may be believed upon the Authority both of the* Church *and* Scriptures. p. 149

§. 28.
Of Jews, Pagans, *and* Mahometans. p. 155

§. 29.
None saved without Faith *in* Christ. p. 162

§. 30.
The Subject Supremacy *and* Infallibility *resumed.* p. 167

§. 31.
No general Defection *foretold by Christ.* p. 171

§. 32.
The Difference between the Synagogue, *and the* Church of Christ. p. 176

§. 33.
Of private Judgment. p. 181

§. 34.
Of the Inspiration *of* Scriptures. *And whether our Belief of it be founded upon* Evidence *excluding* Authority? p. 187

§. 35.
The Scriptures *not falsified by the* Church of Rome. p. 198

§. 36.

Whether Infallibility *excludes Examination?* p. 208

§. 37.

Concerning the Neceſſity of a living Judge of Controverſy. p. 215

§. 38.

The Church *did not fail at the Death of* Chriſt. p. 219.

§. 39.

The Queſtion concerning the Neceſſity of a living Judge reſumed. p. 230

§. 40.

Concerning the Depoſing Power. p. 239

§. 41.

The ſame Subject continued. p. 245

§. 42.

The Oath of Biſhops to the Pope is no Prejudice to their Allegiance. p. 251

§. 43.

The Bulla Cœnæ *miſrepreſented by the* Gentleman. p. 255

§. 44.

Some Touches of the Gentleman's *Politicks.* p. 264

§. 45.

The Supremacy *miſrepreſented by the* Gentleman. p. 271

§. 46.

Of Excommunications. p. 274

§. 47.

Bellarmin *and* Gratian *explain'd.* p. 281

§. 48.

The Subject of Infallibility, *and* private Judgment reſumed. p. 284

§. 49.
An Infallible Guide *is an* Infallible Assurance, *tho we be not* infallible *ourselves.* p. 293

§. 50.
The four pretended contradictory Schemes of Lodging the Infallibility *examined.* p. 299

§. 51.
Of taking up Religion by Education, and how Reason is to be consulted in the Choice of it. p. 306

§. 52.
No Salvation out of the Catholick Church. p. 314

§. 53.
Pope Pius *was not the Author of the* English Schism. p. 324

§. 54.
Protestants *are no Part of the* Catholick Church. p. 334

§. 55.
The Subject of Supremacy *resumed, and most of the* Gentleman's *former Objections repeated.* p. 340

A CON-

A

CONVERSATION

BETWIXT A

ROMAN CATHOLICK LORD,

AND A

GENTLEMAN

OF THE

CHURCH of ENGLAND.

The INTRODUCTION.

Lord. IT is hard that by your laſt Act of *Parliament* I muſt loſe my Eſtate, or change my Religion.

Gentleman. I think your *Lordship* ought not to « loſe your Eſtate, till you have firſt conſider'd, « how far your Conſcience will allow you to con- « form to what is required of you. *pag.* 1. «

L. If I thought I could ſave my Soul in the

Church of England, I would think my ſelf obliged to preſerve my Right, and my Poſterity.

G. » Pray, My Lord, what is there in the Communion of the *Church of England* ſhould make you » think your Soul in Danger? Would there be any » Hazard of your Soul, if there were no *Invocation* » *of Saints*, that are Dead, in the publick Offices of » the Church? No *Pictures* or *Images* of God to be » ſeen there? No *Elevation of the Hoſt*, which was » but of late Years brought into the Church? No » Prayers for Souls out of *Purgatory*? If the publick » Prayers were in the *vulgar Tongue*, and if the *Sa-* » *crament* were given in *both Kinds*? For theſe are all » the differences you will find between your publick » Offices, and ours. *pag.* 2.

L. Sr, I muſt be very ſhortſighted to find no more. For *firſt*, I think *Preaching* is a Part of the publick Service of the Church: and there is ſome difference between your Sermons and ours. For I never heard our Preachers either call the Pope *Antichriſt*, or Catholicks *Idolaters*, or the *Church of Rome*, the *Whore of Babylon*. Neither do we ever hear them tell their Congregation with Dr *Tillotſon*, that *Tranſubſtantiation is a Controverſy of downright Impudence againſt the plain Meaning of Scripture, and all the Senſes and Reaſon of Mankind*. Serm. 26. p. 297. Now, to deal plainly with you, I ſhould think my Soul in Danger of Perishing eternally, if I communicated with a *Church*, that diſperſes *Libels* from the very *Pulpit*, and preaches *Calumnies* inſtead of the *Goſpel*.

But, ſecondly, I think the *Maſs* is a very ſubſtantial Part of our *publick Office*; and I find it not mention'd in your Queries. You ſpeak indeed of the *Elevation of the Hoſt*: But that is no *Eſſential* Part of the *Maſs*; nor is it any Thing to the Purpoſe,

whether it was brought in *of late* or *of Old*: tho in Effect it is Ancienter than *your Church* by above 900 Years. But if the *Church* should think fit to make an Alteration either in that, or any other *Ceremony*, as she may do if she pleaſes, my Salvation would be upon the ſame Footing it is now. In like Manner, if by the ſame Authority no *Pictures* or *Images* were ſeen in our Churches, if the *publick Prayers* were in the *Vulgar Tongue*; and if there were neither any *Invocation of Saints*, nor *Prayers* for the *Dead* in the *publick Liturgy*; finally, if the *Sacrament* were given in *both Kinds*, my Soul would be in no Danger in the Communion of the *Church of Rome*. Becauſe thô her *Diſcipline* would then be changed, her *Faith* would be the ſame, it is now.

But my Salvation would certainly ſuffer Shipwrack, if I should ſeparate myſelf from her *Communion* (as the *Church of England*, and other *reform'd Churches* did, and continue to do) by obſtinately Refuſing to pay a reſpectful Submiſſion to the *Diſcipline* eſtabliſh'd by her. For I think it but reaſonable to allow the *Church* as much *Authority* to regulate her own *Diſcipline*, as the State has to make it's own *Laws*. And therefore as thoſe would be look'd upon as *Factious* and *Seditious Subjects*, who should diſpute *this Authority* in the *State*, ſo they deſerve no better Character, who impeach the *Legiſlative Power* of the *Church*, or by refuſing to ſubmit to it, become guilty of *Schiſm*.

Pray, Sr, do not you argue thus againſt the *Diſſenters*, when they rail at the Book of *common Prayer*, or accuſe you of *Popery* for *Baptizing* with the *Sign* of the *Croſs*, *Kneeling* at the *Communion*, and Uſing many other *Popiſh* Ceremonies? And do you not charge them with *Schiſm* for Separating themſelves from *your Church* upon theſe, and other ſuch Pre-

tences? Now Sr, I should be glad to know how the *Diſſenters* can be guilty of *Schiſm* in Separating themſelves from your *Church*, if the *firſt English Reformers* were free from the Guilt of it, when they ſepatated themſelves from their *Mother-Church*, the *Church of Rome*; in which they had received their *Baptiſm*, whoſe *Faith* they had profeſs'd for many Years, and whoſe *Laws* they were bound to obey as being *Subjects* and *Members* of that Church? And if *they* were *Schiſmaticks*, who firſt went out of their *Mother-Church*, they who tread in the Footſteps of ſuch Forefathers, and continue the *Breach*, they made, can be no better. This, Sr, is a ſufficient Reaſon to think my Soul would be in Danger in the *Communion* of the *Church of England*, or any other *Reform'd Church*: and thus your Queſtions, which a *Lutheran*, or *Calviniſt*, or *Fanatick* might have ask'd as well as yourſelf, are fully anſwer'd.

But let us now ſuppoſe, there were no more Difference between your *publick Office* and ours, than you have mention'd, pray, Sr; is there no Difference between us in *Articles of Faith?* I heartily wish there were not. But I fear there is Difference enough to condemn any Man, that keeps *wilfully*, on the wrong Side of the Queſtion. What do you think of *Tranſubſtantiation*, of *Infallibility*, *Supremacy*, the *Number of Sacraments*, and ſeveral others? Theſe ſurely are Queſtions of ſomewhat greater Moment, than thoſe about *Pictures* hanging in the *Church*, or what Sort of Language we are to ſay our Prayers in. But I preſume they were not ſo well calculated for a *Jeſt*, or to *laugh* a Man out of his Religion.

G. My Lord, the Queſtions, I have put to you, are ſix in Number. The four firſt are *concerning Things no where enjoin'd by God, and yet you practiſe them.* The two laſt are concerning Things, *he has*

expresſly commanded, [viz. *publick Prayers* in the *vulgar Tongue*, and *Communion* in *both Kinds*] *and yet you forbear, and forbid them. Our Worship is therefore purer, and more Orthodox than yours. Vind.*

L. Sr, 'tis falſe, that *publick Prayers* in the *vulgar Tongue*, and *Lay-Communion* in *both Kinds* are commanded by God; as I ſhall demonſtrate, when We come to treat of thoſe Subjects by themſelves, [2. Part. §. 39. 53.] But, as to the four firſt Queſtions, which you ſay are concerning Things *no where enjoin'd by God*, yet *practiſed by us*; Pray, Sr, has the *Church* no *Authority* to ordain any Thing, but what God has expresſly enjoin'd? Has a *Child* no Obligation to obey his *Parents* but in Things, for which there is an expreſs Command of God? Is it lawful for *Subjects* to refuſe Obedience to *ſuperiour Powers*, unleſs they can prove their Commands from ſome expreſs *Text* of *Scripture*? May *Soldiers* lawfully diſobey their *Officer*, when he commands them to march, or halt, or go upon an Attack, unleſs he can produce a *Text* of *Scripture* for it? Or has the *Church* leſs *Authority* than the *State*, or an *Officer*, or *private Parent* to require *Obedience* in Things, that are not expresſly commanded by God?

Sr, I put theſe Queſtions to you to place before your Eyes the *frivolouſneſs* of yours, and convince you, that we are bound to do many Things, which God has not *enjoin'd* us by any expreſs Command, and that by Conſequence my Soul may be in Danger by Refuſing to obey the Authority, he has eſtabliſh'd. Yet a certain Friend of yours has had the Weakneſs not only to cry up your Queſtions as *unanſwerable*, but to Triumph in a very undecent Manner over his Adverſary, becauſe he let them paſs without an Anſwer. Take this then for your final Anſwer, that, tho God has not *enjoin'd* the

Elevation of the Hoſt, the Hanging of *Pictures* or *Images* in the Church, &c. By any expreſs Command, it ſuffices that he has commanded us to *hear* and *obey* the *Church*, and not raiſe *Schiſms* by an obſtinate Diſobedience to her Laws. *God* has not enjoin'd you to *baptize* with *the Sign of the Croſs*, *and yet you practiſe it*: Neither has he commanded the *Common Prayer-Book*, *and yet you uſe it*. Suppoſe then ſome *Phanatical Diſſenter* should put ſuch Queſtions as theſe to you. *Would there be any Hazard of your Soul's Salvation*, *if you should baptize without the Sign of the Croſs? If the Common Prayer-Book were not uſed in the publick Service? Or*, *if you laid aſide the many Popiſh Ceremonies*, *you ſtill retain?* Pray, Sr, would you think ſuch Queſtions to be *unanſwerable?* Nay would you not rather think them impertinent and frivolous? In ſhort, Sr, it is my Judgment, that I cannot be ſaved, unleſs I keep in the *Communion* of the *true Church*.

» *G.* I preſume your *Lordſhip* means the *Communion* of the *Church of Rome*. pag. 2.

L. Sr, I mean the whole Church in Communion with the *Church of Rome*; whoſe Bishop being the Succeſſor of St *Peter* gives her the *Authority* and *Juriſdiction* of the *Mother-Church* over all particular Churches, which compoſe the great Body or Society of Men call'd in the *Nicene Creed* the *One*, *Holy*, *Catholick*, *and Apoſtolick Church*.

§. 1.

Rome the *Mother-Church.*

G. MY Lord, it is certain that *Jeruſalem* was « the *Mother-Church*, where *Chriſt* firſt « planted the *Goſpel*, and commanded that it should « be thence propagated to all other Nations, as « himſelf ſaid, *beginning at Jeruſalem.* Luke 24 47. « And till after the Viſion of the Sheet to St *Peter.* « Act. 11. 19. *They travelled preaching the Word to* « *none but unto the Jews only.* So that the *Jewish Chriſ-* « *tian Church* was the only Church for ſome Time, « and she it was who converted the *Gentile* Nations, « and therefore was the *Mother-Church* to them all. « And *Rome* was not the firſt *Gentile Church.* For the « *Diſciples* were call'd *Chriſtians* firſt in *Antioch.* Act. « 11. 26. And the *Greek Church* was before the *Latin:* « the *New Teſtament* was writ in *Greek* for their Uſe. « Therefore the *Greek Church* could not be the « *Daughter* of the *Latin Church*, which was born after « her. « If *your Lordship alledge that St Peter was Head* « *of the Church, and Biſhop of Rome. I anſwer*, This « will not make her the *Mother-Church.* You may « call her *Supreme*, *Abſolute*, *Univerſal*, or what you « pleaſe, any Thing but the *Mother-Church*, to « which it is impoſſible she should have any Title. « *pag.* 2. 3. «

L. Sr, it is not only poſſible, but clear Fact. What you have ſaid proves indeed, that both *Jeruſalem* and *Antioch*, and perhaps many other Towns received the *Chriſtian Faith* before the City of *Rome.* And the only Conſequence I can draw from it is, that *Rome* is not the *oldeſt* Chriſtian City, nor the moſt ancient *Epiſcopal See* in the World. But you

are pleaſed to inferr likewiſe from it, that therefore she cannot be call'd the *Mother-Church*, and your Reaſon for it, viz. *becauſe the Mother cannot be born after the Daughter*, is ſo very witty and Pretty, that I fear I shall be thought impertinent in not yielding to the force of ſuch ſolid Reaſoning.

However be pleaſed to take Notice, that *Mother-Church* is a *Metaphor*, and a very proper one. But truly, Sr, we shall be forced to lay aſide all *Metaphors*, tho never ſo proper and beautiful, if they muſt all ſtand the *Teſt* of your *Logick*. That is, if there muſt be a Reſemblance in all Reſpects between what they ſignify *figuratively*, and the Thing ſignified *literally* by them.

As for Inſtance, a *crafty Man* is by a very proper *Metaphor* call'd a *Fox*. But if ſome wiſeacre should argue thus, *let him be as crafty as he will, he neither has the Smell, nor Colour, nor Head, nor Tail, nor Shape of a Fox*, therefore *he is no Fox:* I believe he would not get the Reputation of a profound Wit by it. Now, Sr, your Argument Againſt my Calling the *Church of Rome* the *Mother-Church* is much of the ſame Force. You ſay, she is not of *Age* to be the *Mother* of all *Churches*. I anſwer it is not *Age*, that gives her that Denomination. But she has the *Juriſdiction*, the *Power* and *Authority* of a *Mother* over other *Churches:* and that ſuffices to give her a juſt Claim to that Title. As the late Queen *Ann* was ſtiled the *Mother* of her *People*, tho she was not the *oldeſt Woman* in the Nation.

King *James* the *firſt* ſtuck not to own her Title in a Speech to the *Parliament* An. 1603. *I own* (ſays he) *the Church of Rome to be our Mother-Church.* And indeed her Claim to that Title, particularly in Relation to the *Church of England*, is unqueſtionable; becauſe the whole Kingdom of *England* ows it's Con-

verſion

verſion from *Paganiſm* to *Chriſtianity* to the *See* of *Rome*.

G. My Lord, in the Converſion of *Gentiles* to « *Chriſtianity* one Man and one Nation muſt receive « Faith before another. They were not all conver- « ted on a Day. And as when one Man converts « another, ſo it is of *Churches* and *Nations*, it gives « the one no *Superiority* over the other, except that « of *Gratitude* and *Eſteem*, but Nothing of *Authority*. « pag. 3. 4. «

L. 'Tis very true, Sr, that one Nation converting another gives the former no *Authority* over the Latter. And therefore, thô the *Church of Rome* deſerves even upon that Account the Title of being the *Mother-Church* to the *Church of England*, becauſe she *begot her Fore-fathers in* JESUS-CHRIST *through the Goſpel*. I. Cor. 4. ℣. 15. Yet 'tis not on that Title her Claim to *Superiority* is grounded. For this was the Caſe of the *Jewiſh Chriſtian Church*, which (as you obſerved before) converted the *Gentiles*; and therefore was their *Mother* indeed, but not *Superiour*. Nay *Jeruſalem*, where the *Chriſtian Faith* was firſt planted, is the very laſt of the *Patriarchal Sees* in the *Eaſt*: And in St *Jerom's* Time had not even Juriſdiction over *Paleſtine*, but was ſubject to *Ceſarea* it's *Metropolis*, as appears from his 61. Epiſt. to *Pammachius*. So that, tho *Jeruſalem* was the *firſt* in the *Order of Time*, it became afterwards *inferiour* in the *Order of Government*.

The Title therefore, on which the *Church of Rome* grounds her Claim to *Superiority* over other *Churches*, is the *Supremacy* of her *Biſhop*, who in Quality of *Succeſſor* to St *Peter* is *Head* of the *Catholick*, that is, *Univerſal Church*. And this gives her a *ſpiritual Juriſdiction* or *Authority* over all other particular Churches.

his *Vicar* upon Earth; for then he muſt have named it. Yet after all it occurs juſt now to my Mind, that St *Paul* wrote a long Epiſtle to the *Romans*, and in the 1. chap. ℣. 7. he ſalutes them thus. *To all, that be at Rome, beloved of God.* Which I think may be call'd Naming the *Church of Rome.* But that's a trivial Slip amongſt Friends; ſo let it paſs.

» *G.* The Scriptures are wholly ſilent concerning » the ſuppoſed *Univerſal Supremacy* of St *Peter*, or » that he was at *Rome*, or *Biſhop* of *Rome.* Some » After-writers have mention'd it. But that is far » from ſuch an *Univerſal Tradition*, as is ſufficient » for the mighty Superſtructure, which is raiſed » upon it. But let it be granted, it ſignifies Nothing, » *pag.* 4.

L. It really ſignifies Nothing to raiſe Doubts about Things as certainly known and believed as that there has been ſuch a Man as *Julius Cæſar. Grotius* a learned *Proteſtant* Writer was not afraid to ſay, *that no Chriſtian ever doubted but St* Peter *was at* Rome. *In Sinopſi Criticorum.* pag. 1540.

However whether he was at *Rome*, or was *Biſhop* of it, or not, tho the Thing be unqueſtionable, 'tis a Miſtake to ſay, that any *weighty Superſtructure* is built upon that hiſtorical Fact. For all we pretend to maintain as *Eſſential* to the Point in Queſtion, is, that St *Peter* was conſtituted by *Chriſt Head* and *Ruler* of his *Church*, and that when he died, the Church appointed him a *Succeſſor* in that high Station, and has ever ſince done the ſame upon the Demiſe of every Pope; and finally, that all the Succeſſors of St *Peter* have had their *Epiſcopal Seat* at *Rome.* But as to what you ſay, that the *Scriptures* are *ſilent* concerning the *Supremacy* of St *Peter*, this indeed deſerves a more ſerious Conſideration.

» *G.* All is grounded upon ſome Words ſaid to

St *Peter*; as ſuch. *Thou art* Peter, *feed my Sheep*, &c. « Which cannot be ſtrain'd to ſuch an *Univerſal* « *Supremacy*, as Popes have claim'd: nor were ſo un- « derſtood in the *Primitive Church*. pag. 4. 5. «

L. We ſhall examine that preſently. But you are ſlinking away from the Queſtion, which is not what Power *ſome Popes* may perhaps have *claim'd*, but what our *Saviour* gave to St *Peter* and his *Succeſſors* in the two *Texts*, you have *minced*, as if you were afraid to ſpeak out.

G. In the learned Monſieur *du Pin*, *Traité de* « *la Puiſſance Eccleſiaſtique & Temporelle*, printed at « *Paris* An. 1707. pag. 495. to p. 501. and pag. 754. « to p. 765. your *Lordſhip* will find theſe two Texts « urged for the *Supremacy* of St *Peter*, and anſwer'd « in the ſame Manner as is done by *Proteſtant* Wri- « ters; and it is ſhew'd how very foreign they are « from the purpoſe intended. *pag.* 5. «

L. Sr, Monſieur *du Pin* no where denies the Pope's *Supremacy* in *Spirituals*, but only in *Temporals*; of which he maintains thoſe Texts to be no Proof. But let us now proceed to examine the true Meaning of them. I ſhall begin with that of St *Mathew* 16. ℣. 18,

§. 3.

The Text *of St* Mathew 16. ℣. 18. *examined.*

IT is as follows. *And I ſay alſo unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.*

I know the common Anſwer to this Text is, that by the *Rock* is meant St *Peter's Faith*, and not his *Perſon*. But tho the former interpretation be true, it is far from being the only one or excluding St *Peter's Perſon*. Nay the Application of it to his *Perſon*

of St *Mathew* to St *Peter's Perſon.* For the Queſtion between you and me is not, whether ſome of them have applied that Text to St *Peter's Faith*, which no Body denies; but whether they poſitively exclude his *Perſon?* And the Paſſages you will be referr'd to by the forementioned Author, will convince you, they have not.

G. I hope your *Lordſhip* will not deny, that St *Cyril* of *Alex.* poſitively excludes his *Perſon.*

L. Sr, I ſhall make bold to deny it.

G. Do's he not ſay expreſly *Dial.* 4. de *Trin.* that *Chriſt gave the Name of the Rock to nothing elſe but the conſtant and unſhaken Faith of the Diſciple?*

C. He do's ſo. But unleſs you will make him contradict himſelf, his Meaning can be no other, than *that St Peter merited that Title by nothing elſe but his Faith.* Pray, Sr, do's not St *Jerom*, Epiſt. 61. ad *Pammachium.* Tom. 2. p. 254. ſay as expreſly, that it was not St *Peter's Body*, but his *Faith*, that walk'd upon the Water. *Super aquas non Corpus Petri ambulaſſe ſed fidem.* And will you conclude from thence, that it was St *Jerom's* Opinion, that St *Peter's Body* or *Perſon* did not walk upon the Waters?

But nothing can be fairer than to let St *Cyril* ſpeak for himſelf: For ſurely he underſtood his own Meaning beſt. His Words (L. 2. in Joh. Ed. Par. an. 1638. Tom. 4. p. 131.) are theſe. *He* (Chriſt) *foretold he ſhould no more be call'd Simon, but Peter. Signifying by that word moſt Properly, that he intended to build his Church* UPON HIM, *as upon a moſt firm and ſolid Rock.* Now, Sr, you cannot ſave him from manifeſtly contradicting himſelf, unleſs you join with me in Saying, that St *Peter*, according to this Father, *merited* the Title (which *Chriſt* beſtow'd upon him) by his *Faith alone*, and received it *in his Perſon.*

G. But,

G. But, My Lord, take it now for granted, that the Text of St *Mathew* is meant of St *Peter's Perſon*, what Advantage can you make of it for the Proof of his *Supremacy*? For you can infer no more from it than that the *Church* was to be *built* upon St *Peter*. And ſo it was to be built upon the reſt of the *Apoſtles* according to St *Paul* Eph. 2. ℣. 20. *Ye are built upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus-Chriſt himſelf being the Chief Corner-Stone.* This plainly puts them all upon the Level. *Vind.*

L. How induſtrious are Men to deceive themſelves when Intereſt and Paſſion inclines them to it! You argue thus. St *Paul* ſays, *the Church is built upon all the other Apoſtles jointly with St Peter*, therefore *they are all upon the Level.* But I deny your Conſequence. For, tho she be built upon them *all*, it do's not follow, that she is built upon them all *in the ſame Manner*: But she may be built upon one in a more *eminent Manner* than the reſt. The Frame of the *English* Government is built upon *king* and *Parliament*. But do's that put them upon the Level? or hinder the *king* from being the *ſupreme Head* of all?

But let us hear St *Paul*, Eph. 4. ℣. 11. 12. *And he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors and Teachers for the Perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Miniſtry, for the* EDIFYING *of the Body of Chriſt.* Here ordinary *Paſtors* and *Teachers* are join'd with *Apoſtles*, *Prophets*, and *Evangeliſts*. And it is equally ſaid of them all, that *Chriſt* gave them for the EDIFYING of his *Myſtical Body*: that is, the *Building* of his *Church*. And will you infer from thence, that the Church is built in the *ſame Degree* upon ordinary *Paſtors* and *Teachers* as upon the *Apoſtles* themſelves? Or that she is not built in a more *eminent Manner* upon *Bishops*, than the *Inferiour Clergy*? Will you conclude from it,

G. I presume your *Lordship* means in those Words, *feed my Sheep.*

L. I do so. But tho you have clipp'd them to make them lose some Part of their Weight, I shall make bold to quote the whole Text as it lies, and make my Observations upon it.

Christ on the very Day of his *Resurrection* had confirm'd St *Peter*, and the other *Apostles* in their *Apostolical* Charge. Joh. 20. ℣. 21. *As my Father sent me, so I send you, &c.* And 'tis certain, they all received here an equal *Apostolical* Charge or *Jurisdiction.* But *Christ* appearing afterwards to St *Peter*, St *John*, St *James*, St *Thomas*, and some of the Disciples, after he had eaten with them, he address'd himself thus to St *Peter. Simon Son of Jonas loveſt thou me more than theſe? He ſaith unto him, yea Lord, thou knoweſt that I love thee. He ſaith unto him, feed my Lambs. He ſaith unto him again the ſecond Time, Simon of Jonas loveſt thou me? He ſaith unto him, yea Lord, thou knoweſt that I love thee. He ſaith unto him, feed my Lambs. He ſaith to him the third Time, Simon Son of Jonas, loveſt thou me? Peter was grieved becauſe he ſaid unto him the third Time, loveſt thou me? And he ſaid, Lord, thou knoweſt all Things, and thou knoweſt that I love thee. Jeſus ſaith unto him feed my Sheep.* Joh. 21. ℣. 15. 16. &c.

I obſerve here an unuſual Ceremony, ſuch as is no where elſe to be found in the whole New Teſtament. St *Peter* is ſingled out from the reſt of the Company. *Christ* asks him, *loveſt thou me more than theſe?* He asks him a ſecond and third Time, *loveſt thou me?* And after each Anſwer and Aſſurance of his Love, *Christ* gives him an *unlimited* Commiſſion to *feed his Flock.* Whoever can ſee nothing here attributed peculiarly to St *Peter*, muſt ſhut his Eyes wilfully againſt the ſtrongeſt Light.

G. I own, My Lord, I have not Eyes to ſee it.

For *it was the neceſſary Duty of all the Apoſtles during their Time, and of their Succeſſors in all following Generations t feed our Saviour's Lambs and Sheep. And if St Peter was required to do the ſame, this implies no more Juriſdiction in him, than in the other Apoſtles; on each of which this Duty was no leſs incumbent than on him.* I add, *that if the Words themſelves do not convey any ſuch paramount Juriſdiction, the Repetition of them can never do it.* Vind. p. 21. 22.

L. 'Tis true, that a Repetition of Words do's not change their literal Signification. But no reaſonable Man will ſay, it do's not enforce their Weight; or that it do's not mark out a more than ordinary *Importance* of the *Duty*, or Injunction contain'd in Words, that are thus repeated; eſpecially when it is done by a Perſon of the greateſt Authority. And therefore our Saviour's *threefold* Repetition both of the Queſtion put to St *Peter*, and the Command laid upon him *to feed his Lambs and Sheep* was doubtleſs intended to imprint in his Mind an Idea of ſome extraordinary injunction. The Queſtion itſelf, *loveſt thou me more than theſe?* Manifeſtly imports that *Chriſt* required a greater Love of St *Peter*, than the other *Apoſtles*. And why ſo?

G. My Lord, perhaps our *Saviour* only put this Queſtion to him to put him in Mind of his former Profeſſion of a ſingular Love above the other *Apoſtles.* *

L. What, Sr! to put him in Mind of it without requiring it of him! The Queſtion plainly implies the contrary, and I aſk the Reaſon of it. So pray, Sr, gueſs once more.

G. Perhaps it was only to humble him under the Senſe of his dreadful Fall and thus to quicken his

* *Caſe further ſtated*, pag. 27.

Care, and excite his Zeal be the Remembrance of his paſt Miſcarriage. 1.*

L. This Gueſs, Sr, is as unlucky as the former. For if *Chriſt* only intended to humble him under the Senſe of his dreadful Fall, it would have ſufficed to have ask'd him *doſt thou love me?* Or *doſt thou love me* AS MUCH *as theſe?* By Way of Inſinuation, that *they* had not denied him, as he had done; which would have been very *humbling*. But *Chriſt* ask'd him, *loveſt thou me* MORE *than theſe?* So this Gueſs is likewiſe unſatisfactory.

G. However I have St *Ambroſe* for my Voucher, who writes thus. *For he, who had denied his Lord thrice, confeſſes him thrice, and obtains Grace by Loving as often as he contracted the Guilt of Sin by his fall.* Serm. 48. 2.*

L. Sr, St *Ambroſe* makes here only a Compariſon between St *Peter's* triple *Profeſſion* of Love, and his threefold *Denial* of *Chriſt*; but ſays not a Word of the Reaſon why *Chriſt* ask'd him, *if he loved him* MORE *than theſe?* And ſo his Words do not in the leaſt favour your Gueſs. I ſhall therefore endeavour to give a better Reaſon for it, and it is this. Becauſe the higher a Perſon is raiſed in the *Miniſtry* of the *Goſpel*, the greater his Love ought to be for *Chriſt* to enable him to fulfil his Truſt. And therefore ſince *Chriſt* demanded a greater Love of St *Peter* than the other *Apoſtles*, even the beloved Diſciple St *John*, who was preſent, 'tis more than a Gueſs to conclude from it; that the Command he then laid upon him to *feed his Lambs and Sheep* raiſed him to a higher Station than the other *Apoſtles*. Neither was this intended as a Leſſon to St *Peter* alone, but to all his *Succeſſors*, who without an ex-

1. * *Caſe farther ſtated*, pag. 27. 2. * *Ibidem.*

traordinary Love of God, and Zeal for his *Church*, can never be fitly qualified to diſcharge their important Truſt of *feeding both the Lambs and Sheep of Chriſt*; that is, of Governing his *whole Flock*: which is the true Meaning of that Text.

G. But pray, My Lord, was it not the neceſſary Duty of *all* the Apoſtles to *feed our Saviour's Lambs and Sheep?* Vind. p. 21.

L. Not in the ſame *unlimited* Senſe as St *Peter* was charged with it. But leaſt this may appear to be *gratis dictum*, it is here neceſſary to obſerve, that the ſame Words may either have a more *reſtrain'd*, or *ample* Signification according to the *Circumſtances* they are ſpoken in, or the *Perſons* they are applied to: and nothing is more *Sophiſtical*, than to infer from their Signification in Reference to one Perſon, that they bear the ſame Senſe in Reference to another. As for Inſtance, *Chriſt* calls himſelf *the Light of the World*, Joh. 8. ℣. 12. and he calls his Apoſtles *the Light of the World*, Math. 5. ℣. 14. Now if any one ſhould argue thus, The *Apoſtles* are call'd the *Light of the World* as well as *Chriſt*, therefore this implies nothing in *Chriſt above* the *Apoſtles*: would he not deſerve to be pitied rather than anſwer'd? In like Manner, all that are impowr'd to *preach* the *Goſpel*, *Catechiſe*, or *Inſtruct*, are properly commiſſion'd to *feed the Flock of Chriſt*, but do's it therefore follow, that their *Juriſdiction* is equal to what *Chriſt* gave to St *Peter?* If not; neither can we conclude, that he had not a more *ample Juriſdiction* than the other *Apoſtles*, who certainly were all commiſſion'd *to feed the Flock of Chriſt*. In Effect, the *other* Apoſtles had no Juriſdiction over one another; but St *Peter's Juriſdiction* reach'd them all by Virtue of thoſe Words.

G. My Lord, this is the very Point, you are to prove: for I ſhall not believe it upon your bare Word.

L. Sr, I have already begun to prove it, *firſt* from our *Saviour's* Demanding a greater Degree of Love of St *Peter* than the other *Apoſtles*; which was a natural *Preamble* to his Laying a greater Charge upon him. I have likewiſe proved it from the peculiar *Ceremony* and *Solemnity*, with which this Action was perform'd; which as it is without Example in the New Teſtament, and as the whole Ceremony regarded St *Peter's Perſon* alone, as diſtinguish'd from the other *Apoſtles*, ſo it is but congruous to common Senſe to infer from it, that it convey'd ſomething to him above the reſt.

I prove it 3dly thus; the Fact, we have under Debate, happen'd at our Saviour's *third* Apparition to his *Diſciples*. Joh. 21. ℣. 14. Now *Chriſt* had inſtall'd both St *Peter*, and the *other Apoſtles* in the common Exerciſe of their *Apoſtleſhip* or *Miſſion* at his very *firſt* Apparition to 'em, *Joh.* 20. ℣. 21. *&c.* when he gave *them all* their full *Powers* and *Credentials* to *preach* the *Goſpel* to all Nations. This then was already done: and there needed not a *new* and *extraordinary* Ceremony to inſtall St *Peter* in an Employment already beſtow'd upon him in Common with the other *Apoſtles*; or to *renew* his Commiſſion any more than that of all the reſt. And why then did our *Saviour* addreſs himſelf to St *Peter* alone, and not likewiſe to the other *Apoſtles* then preſent, if it was not to charge him with ſomething, that was not to be common to all, and in which they were to have no Share with him? When you give a direct Rational Anſwer to this Queſtion, you will ſay ſomething to the Purpoſe.

G. My Lord, *Chriſt* only commanded St *Peter* to *feed his Flock*. Now according to St *Bernard*, L. 4. C. 3. de Conſid. to *preach* the *Goſpel* is to *feed*. *

L. Sr,

* *Caſe farther ſtated*, p. 37.

L. Sr, this do's not anſwer but decline the Queſtion. To *preach* the *Goſpel* was the Charge of all the *Apoſtles* in Common, for which they had already received their *Commiſſion*. And my Queſtion is, what need there was of *renewing* St *Peter's Commiſſion* any more than that of all the reſt? My Queſtion is, why our *Saviour* addreſs'd himſelf to St *Peter alone* in the Preſence of other *Apoſtles*, if it was not to charge him with ſomething, that was not to be common to all? This Queſtion is yet unanſwer'd.

G. My Lord, St *Peter* was certainly the *Apoſtle* of the *Jews* in a particuliar Manner; And the *Jews* are likewiſe in a peculiar Manner ſtiled in Scripture *God's Sheep*. And why then might not theſe be the *Sheep*, he was here commiſſion'd to *feed*. *

L. What, Sr, did our Saviour then intend by thoſe Words to reſtrain St *Peter's former Commiſſion*, and *limit* it to the *Jews* alone! Was this the Thing meant by that *unuſual* and *extraordinary* Ceremony! Was it for this, *Chriſt* ask'd him, whether he loved him *more* than the other *Apoſtles*, and charg'd him in ſuch a particular Manner to *feed* his *Lambs* and *Sheep*? Truly, Sr, when a Man of Senſe is driven to ſuch an Anſwer as this, 'tis a Sign, he is hard put to it.

But let us ſee, whether venerable Antiquity ever gave any of theſe pretty Turns to our *Saviour's* Words. St *Eucherius* Bishop of *Lions*, who lived in the Beginning of the 5th Age, wrote thus upon the Eve of St *Peter's* Feaſt. *Firſt Chriſt entruſted him with his Lambs, next with his Sheep: becauſe he made him not only a Shepherd, but* THE SHEPHERD OF SHEPHERDS. *Peter them feeds the Lambs, he alſo feeds the Sheep. He feeds both the Young and their Mothers.* HE RULES BOTH SUBJETS AND PRELATES. HE IS THEREFORE A SHEPHERD OVER

D

* *Caſe farther ſtated.* p. 30.

ALL. *For beſides Lambs and Sheep there is Nothing in the Church.*

This I think is very plain. And we cannot doubt but this Ancient Father deliver'd the current Doctrine of the *Church* in his Time, and ſo is an Authentick Witneſs of it. His Words confirm my Obſervation upon the *unlimited* Commiſſion given to St *Peter* in the Text in Queſtion, and anſwer all your Arbitrary Explanations of it.

But let us hear St *Chryſoſtom* next, who treating of the Election of St *Mathias*, Hom. 3. in Act. writes thus of St *Peter*. *See how he acknowledges the Flock entruſted to him. How he is the Prince of the Choire. He had Reaſon to act here the firſt of all* WITH AUTHORITY, *having them all deliver'd into his Hands.*

Here my Obſervation on St *John* is again inforced, and St *Peter* is expreſſly declared to have acted *the firſt of all with Authority.* And why? Becauſe (ſays St *Chryſoſtom*) *he had them all deliver'd into his Hands.*

Origen upon St *Paul's* Epiſt. to the *Romans*, cap. 6. pag. 639. ſpeaks the ſame Language. *Petro cum ſummarum rerum de paſcendis Ovibus traderetur, & ſuper ipſum velut ſuper Petram fundaretur Eccleſia, &c.* That is, *when the* CHIEF POWER *of feeding the Sheep was given to Peter, and the Church was built* UPON HIM *as upon a Rock; the Profeſſion of no other Virtue was required of him than that of Love.* Here both Texts are join'd together for Proof of St *Peter's Supremacy.*

'Tis true a Friend of your's, Sr, carps at the Tranſlation of this laſt Piece. But if a Jury of Grammarians were impannel'd, I believe they would give their Verdict againſt him.

G. Pray, My Lord, be not tedious in your Quotations. For we have no Time to loſe.

L. Well, Sr, then for Brevity's Sake I refer you

for about half a Score Fathers more to *the Church of Christ shew'd, &c.* Part. 3. C. 2. §. 1. And from them all I think we may ſoberly conclude, that Dr *Tillotſon* had a Forehead of Braſs, and a ſear'd Conſcience when he told his Reader in his *Preface* to Dr *Barrow's* Book of *Supremacy*, that *the Pope's Supremacy is not only an indefenſible, but an impudent Cauſe. That there is not a tolerable Argument for it, but there are a thouſand invincible Reaſons againſt it.* That *the paſt and preſent State of Chriſtendom, the Hiſtories and Records of all Ages are a perpetual Demonſtration againſt it.* That *there is no Ground in the World for it. But that now of a long Time it has been by the Pope's Janizaries boldly aſſerted, and ſtifly contended for without Reaſon.*

If Strutting and Swaggering will do the Work, the poor *Pope* is loſt without Remedy. But he has, ſtill ſome good Old Troops of *Janizaries* to ſtand by him. The *Fathers* I have quoted, and refer'd you to, are of the Number, and they have two good *Generals* at the Head of them, namely St *Mathew* and St *John*. So I dare venture them againſt the *Doctor*; who indeed had nothing ſo much at Heart as to write *good English*, or make a *Flourish*: but left Truth to ſhift for itſelf.

§. 5.

The Gentleman's *Objections againſt St* Peter's *Supremacy Anſwer'd.*

G. MY Lord, nothing that was ſaid of St *Peter* is ſo expreſs for an *Univerſal Supremacy*, as what St *Paul* ſaid of himſelf, 2. Cor. 11. ℣. 28. *that the Care of all Churches lay upon him.* And again, 1. Cor. 7. ℣. 17. *So I ordain in all Churches.* If ſuch a *Decretal* could be produced of St *Peter's*,

» I doubt not it would have been made Uſe of towards » Proving his *Univerſal Supremacy*. pag. 5.

L. If nothing be ſo expreſs for St *Peter's Supremacy*, as the *two Texts*, you have quoted, are for St *Paul's*, pray, Sr, how comes it to paſs, that not one of the ancient Fathers has produced thoſe Texts in Favour of St *Paul*, and ſuch a *Cloud* of thoſe venerable Witneſſes have urged the two former Texts from St *Mathew* and St *John* in Favour of St *Peter*? Let me tell you, Sr, this looks a little Scurvily; and I fear you will have ſome Difficulty to give a ſatisfactory Anſwer to it, For it is apt to make a Man conclude, there is ſome better *Decretal* for St *Peter's* Supremacy than for St *Paul's*.

But let us conſider the *Texts* themſelves. You ſay St *Paul* ſays of himſelf, 2. Cor. 11. *v.* 28. *That the Care of all Churches lay upon him.* But let us hear the whole text, and it will explain itſelf. He writes thus. *In Wearineſs and Painfulneſs, in Watchings often, in Hunger and Thirſt, in Faſtings often, in Cold and Nakedneſs. Beſides thoſe Things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the Care of all the Churches. Who is Weak, and I am not Weak?* Here St *Paul* makes an Enumeration of all his Troubles and Pains both in *Body* and *Mind*; and tells us, that beſides the *Bodily* Sufferings enumerated by him, he was continually oppreſs'd in Mind with *Care* and *Solicitude* for all the Churches; which ſhews indeed that he was a moſt excellent *Apoſtle*, fill'd with *Zeal* and *Charity* for the *whole Church of Chriſt*, as doubtleſs all the *Apoſtles* were; and if either St *Peter*, or any other amongſt them had ſaid the ſame of himſelf, how it ſhould be ſtrain'd into a *Decretal* for any *Superiority* over the reſt, is beyond my Comprehenſion.

Your ſecond Text, *ſo I ordain in all Churches*, is ſtill leſs to the Purpoſe, 'tis plain, it cannot be

litterally extended to all particular Churches whatſoever. As the Churches of *Parthia*, *Ethiopia*, *India*, or *Scythia*; in which the Goſpel was preach'd by St *Thomas*, St *Bartholomew* and St *Andrew*; but not by St *Paul*. Nor did he ever write to any of thoſe Churches.

G. What means then his Saying, *So I ordain in all Churches*?

L. Sr, it means, that St *Paul* was *uniform* in his Orders and Inſtructions. It means, that what he *ordain'd* in the Church of *Corinth*, he likewiſe *ordain'd* in all the *other Churches*, that were under his immediate Direction. For tho every *Apoſtle* had a *general Commmiſſion* to teach *all Nations*, and a *Juriſdiction* over all the *Churches*, yet their Labours were divided, and *every Apoſtle* did not in Perſon teach *every Nation*, but only that, which fell to his particular Lot. So that St *Paul's* Saying, *and ſo I ordain in all Churches*, cannot be underſtood of *Churches* which he never inſtructed either by *Letter*, or by *Word of Mouth*, but ſuch as were particularly under his Inſpection. And is it not then very likely, that if St *Peter* had ſaid as much of himſelf, we should have improved it into an Argument for his *Superiority* over the other *Apoſtles!* You tell me however, that *if we had ſuch a Decretal for St Peter's Supremacy, we ſhould make good Uſe of it.* Then, Sr, 'tis very lucky for us that we have it not; for it might have tempted us to trifle as ſome of our Neighbours do.

* *G.* But pray, My Lord, *is this your Way of Anſwering? The Apoſtle poſitively declares*, So I ordain in all Churches. *And you make bold to contradict him, and tell him, he had nothing to do to iſſue forth his Orders for any but thoſe under his more immediate Inſpection. As if*

* *Vind. pag.* 32.

St Paul *did not underſtand his own Buſineſs, and the Extent of his Power, till you came to direct him, and ſettle it for him.*

L. Really, Sr, tho I am far from Preſuming to contradict St *Paul*, or queſtion his underſtanding perfectly well his *own Buſineſs*, and the *Extent* of his *Power*; yet I am ſtill of Opinion, *firſt*, that he never either *travell'd*, or *ſent Letters* into *Parthia*, *Æthiopia*, *India*, or *Scythia*. And *2dly*, that he could not *ordain* Things in *Churches*, he neither ever ſaw, nor ever writ to. So pray, Sr, be not ſo uppish, till you be ſure at leaſt, that you ſpeak Senſe.

» *G.* My Lord, in the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles* it is » told, that St *Paul* was at *Rome* preaching the Goſ» pel two whole Years together. *Act.* 28. ℣. 30. But » not a Word of St *Peter's* being there. *pag.* 5. 6.

L. To the beſt of my knowledge, Sr, and I am ſure of your's too, the *Acts* are a Hiſtory of St *Paul's* Life, and not of St *Peter's*. And is it ſuch a Wonder, that an Hiſtorian writing the Life of one Man, should not run aſtray from his Subject to inſiſt upon Particulars relating to another?

» *G.* As St *Paul* planted the Goſpel at *Rome*, ſo » he wrote to the Church there as his particular » Charge. For he ſays, *Rom.* 11. ℣. 16. *I ſpeak to you* » *Gentiles, in as much, as I am the Apoſtle of the Gen*» *tiles, I magnify my Office.* pag. 6.

L. Good, Sr, did St *Paul* plant the Goſpel at *Rome* before he ever was there? That's News indeed. The Goſpel then had been planted at *Rome* ſome Years before he wrote his Epiſtle to the *Romans*; which was 15 Years after St *Peter* had fix'd his Seat there. And to ſhew he never had been there, he writes thus to'em *Now I would not have you be ignorant, Brethren, that oftentimes I purpoſed to come unto you, but was let hitherto.* Rom. 1. ℣. 13. In Effect, it

was towards the End of his Life, he came to *Rome*; and when he was there, he contributed very much towards the Encreaſe of Chriſt's Flock by his continual Preaching for the Space of two Years amongſt them.

G. My Lord, As St *Paul* was the *Apoſtle* of the « *Gentiles*, ſo St *Peter* was the *Apoſtle* of the *Jews*; « they were his particular Charge; and he himſelf « allow'd *that the Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion was com-* « *mitted to* Paul, *as the Goſpel of Circumciſion was to* « *himſelf.* Gal. 2. ℣. 7. 8. 9. And accordingly he di- « rected his Epiſtle to the *Jews* of the Diſperſion « throughout *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Capadocia*, *Aſia*, and « *Bithynia*. But he wrote not to the *Gentiles*, parti- « cularly not to *Rome*; which would ſeem ſtrange, « if he had been *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and that had been « his chief and principal Charge. *pag.* 6. «

L. Pray, Sr, is it ſo very ſtrange he ſhould not write particularly to thoſe, amongſt whom he reſided for the moſt Part? Did St *James* direct his *Canonical Epiſtle* to the Church of *Jeruſalem*, whereof he was Biſhop? And why then is it ſo ſtrange, that St *Peter* ſhould not write to the *Romans?*

But as to what you ſay, that St *Paul* was the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, and St *Peter* of the *Jews:* I anſwer, that as *Chriſt* was a *Miniſter of the Circumciſion.* Rom. 15. ℣. 8. So his chief *Vicar* took that Part of the Vineyard to cultivate in a more particular Manner to his Share. But neither was his Juriſdiction confined to the *Jews*, nor St *Paul's* to the *Gentiles.* Did not *God chooſe that the Gentiles by Peter's Mouth ſhould hear the Word of God, and believe?* Act. 15. ℣. 7. by whom even the firſt *Gentiles* were baptiz'd at *Caſarea*, Act. 10. ℣. 48. So we find St *Paul* preaching in the *Synagogue.* Act. 13. ℣. 2. Act. 18. ℣. 4. 11. *as a choſen Veſſel to bear Chriſt's Name before the Gentiles.*

and Kings, and Children of Iſrael. Act. 11. ℣. 15. In a Word, St *Peter* and St *Paul*, and the other Apoſtles as well as they, had *Juriſdiction* over all *Chriſtian Churches*, whether of converted *Jews* or *Gentiles*; tho their Labours were divided, according as Occaſion required, or as they were directed by the *Divine Spirit.* All which is no Proof, that St *Peter* was not the *Head* of the *Apoſtles.*

» *G.* St *Paul's* bold *Withſtanding him to the Face* » before the whole Church of *Antioch* in behalf of » the *Gentiles*, whom he had miſled; *fearing them who* » *were of the Circumciſion*, ſhews the Care St *Paul* took » of thoſe, who were more particularly his Charge; » and ſeems a Behaviour not very ſuitable to the » *ſupreme Head* of the *Church* both *Jews* and *Gen-* » *tiles*, if St *Paul* had known any Thing of St *Pe-* » *ter's* being ſo conſtituted by *Chriſt.* pag. 6.

L. St, his *bold Withſtanding* is a Mark indeed of his *Zeal*; but neither of his *Superiority*, nor *Equality* to St *Peter* in the *College* of the *Apoſtles.* Is not the *Council* bound to withſtand the *King*, if he propoſes any Thing contrary to Law, or the natural Liberties and Properties of the Subject? And will you infer from thence, that the *King* has no *Superiority* or *Authority* over his *Council?* Suppoſe the Biſhop of *Canterbury* ſhould preach or write any Thing to the Prejudice of the *Church of England*, would a *private Doctor* think it a Preſumption to withſtand his *Superiour*, and write boldly againſt him?

But let St *Auſtin* anſwer for me. *St Peter* (ſays he) *in whom the Primacy of the Apoſtles appear'd with ſo Surpaſſing a Grace, was reprehended by a latter Apoſtle.* L. 2. de Bap. C. 1. And tho St *Paul's* Zeal is to be admired, St *Peter's* Humility in this Occaſion is far more extoll'd by ſome of the Fathers. St *Gregory's* Words are remarkable. *He became* (ſays St Greg.)

the

the Follower of one leſs than himſelf, that even here he might go before him: to the End, that he, who was firſt in the higheſt Dignity of the Apoſtleship, might alſo be the firſt in humility. In *Latin* thus. *Atque in eadem re factus eſt ſequens* MINORIS SUI, *etiam ut in hoc prairet, Quatenus qui* PRIMUS *erat in Apoſtolatus culmine, eſſet & primus in Humilitate.* Hom. 18. in Ezek. tom. 2. pag. 1180. This puts it beyond Diſpute, what theſe two Fathers thought of St *Peter's Supremacy*, and makes it plain that a *Superiour* may be reprehended by an *Inferiour* without Prejudice to his *Authority*.

G. Methinks, My Lord, it did not become the « other *Apoſtles* to ſend their *Sovereign* upon Buſi- « neſs, as they ſent *Peter* to *Samaria*. Act. 8. ℣. 14. « pag. 6. «

L. Indeed, Sr, your Stock of Arguments grows very low, when this muſt ſerve for one. Is it ſuch an unuſual Thing for the *whole Body* to depute their *Superiour upon* Buſineſs, wherein the common Cauſe is concern'd? A *Biſhop* may be deputed by his *Dioceſs*, a *Chancellor* by the *Univerſity*, and even a *Prince* by the *Senate*. As the *Jews* ſent their high Prieſt *Iſmael* with other Embaſſadors to *Nero*. Joſ. L. 20. Ant. C. 7.

G. If it be true, as ſome ſay, that St *Peter* was « *Biſhop* of the *Jewiſh* Convert's at *Rome*, and St *Paul* « of the *Gentiles* there, St *Paul* would have had a « much greater Flock than St *Peter*, and the *Succeſ-* « *ſors* of St *Paul* and not of St *Peter*, muſt have been « *Biſhops* there; becauſe the Church of *Rome* is now, « and has long been all of the *Gentiles*. pag. 7. «

L. All of the Gentiles, Sr? How do yow know that? But let that be as it will, tho the perſonal Application, or immediate Inſpection of the two Apoſtles was perhaps divided, whilſt they were together, their *Juriſdiction* was not: And it is nothing

to the Purpoſe, which of the two had the greater Number to inſtruct: For the whole Flock belong'd to them both in Quality of *Apoſtles*. But let us ſuppoſe St *Paul* was alſo Bishop of *Rome*, all that will follow from it, is, that the *Popes* ſucceeded both St *Peter* and St *Paul* in the Government of the *Roman Dioceſs*; which will not hinder their Succeeding St *Peter* alone in the Government of the *whole Church*. However it was a Thing unknown to Antiquity to call the Bishop of *Rome*, the Succeſſor of St *Paul*.

» *G.* My Lord, the ſureſt Way to find out the » Truth is by Fact, and not ſtraining Expreſſions, » which may have ſeveral Meanings. The *Eaſtern* » Monarchs have uſed to give themſelves mighty » Titles, as Son of the Sun, and Brother of the » Stars, and King of all the Kings of the Earth, » &c. But will any believe, that any of them was » the Univerſal Monarch for all this contrary to » plain Fact? *pag.* 7.

L. No, Sr, what then?

» *G.* Then let me ask you, do you think one » could write the Hiſtory of a King, ſuppoſe of » King *Charles* the 2d, and in all the Hiſtory nei- » ther call him *King*, mention *his* Reſtoration, Co- » ronation, or tell one *Regal* Act, he ever did, as » Calling a Parliament, or Preſiding in it, Sending, » or Receiving an Embaſſador, or Granting a Com- » miſſion, &c. And ſo of a *Pope*, could his Hiſtory » be wrote without Calling him *Pope*, or Telling of » one *Papal* Act of his? *pag.* 7.

L. No, Sr, no more than St *Paul's* Life can be writ without Calling him *Paul*. But the Life of St *Paul* may be writ without a Recital of the Particulars of St *Peter's* Life.

» *G.* Pray, My Lord, let me apply what I have » ſaid. We have the Hiſtory of the *Acts of the*

Apoſtles in which St *Peter* has a great Share, tho « not ſo much as St *Paul.* «

And there is a Council. *pag.* 7. 8.

L. Hold, Sr, you shall tell your Story out immediately. But I deſire you to anſwer me firſt. Are the *Acts* a Hiſtory of *all* the *Apoſtles?*

G. No, My Lord. But St *Peter* has a great Share in them, as I told you.

L. And I shall let you know how great a Share he has. St *Luke*, the Author of the *Acts*, was St *Paul's* Diſciple; and the *Acts* are properly a Hiſtory of his Life from his *Converſion* till his Coming to *Rome*, where St *Luke* alſo takes Leave of him. Nay many of the Apoſtles, as St *Andrew*, St *Thomas*, St *Bartholomew*, &c. Are but once named before the Deſcent of the *Holy Ghoſt*, and never after. And St *Peter's* Life and Actions are no farther related than was neceſſary to give a ſuccinct Account of the firſt Planting of the *Goſpel*, and the Progreſs it made in the firſt Year after our *Saviour's* Paſſion; in which indeed St *Peter* had the greateſt Share, and acted on all Occaſions like the *Maſter-Workman*; particularly in the Election of St *Mathias*, as St *Chryſoſtom* has obſerved, Hom. 3. in Act. So that we have but one Year of St *Peter's* Life in the *Acts.* After the 12th Chapter St *Luke* ſpeaks no more of him but occaſionally in the 15th, becauſe the Hiſtory of his Maſter St *Paul* required it; whoſe Labours and Sufferings are the whole Subject of the laſt 16 Chapters of the *Acts.* And ſo it is no greater Wonder that we know no more of St *Peter*, than that we know nothing at all of the greateſt Part of the *Apoſtles.* And the Reaſon of both is, becauſe St *Luke's* principal Deſign was to relate the Apoſtolical Labours of St *Paul*, whoſe Life was very inſtructive, becauſe he had been a violent Perſecutor of the Church.

Now, Sr, you may make your Application, if you pleaſe. But your Market is pretty well foreſtall'd.

§. 6.

The Objections from the Council *of* Jeruſalem *anſwer'd.*

» *G.* I was going to tell you, My Lord, that there is a *Council* mention'd, wherein both » St *Peter* and St *Paul* were preſent: and there is » not a Tittle of any *Superiority* of St *Peter* over St » *Paul*, or any of the other *Apoſtles*, either in that » *Council*, or any where elſe throughout the whole » Hiſtory; which is impoſſible, if St *Peter* had that » *Supremacy*, which the *Popes* have claim'd as his » *Succeſſors*. This is ſo demonſtrative a Proof, that » the Writers on your Side think it neceſſary for » them to endeavour ſome Solution to it. But the » Weakneſs of their Anſwer is a yet greater Con» firmation on our Side. *pag.* 8.

L. It ſeems however the Writers on our Side do not think it inſolvable; and I am of their Mind. But, Sr, your Memory fails you in Telling me, there is not any Thing concerning St *Peter's Superiority* over the Apoſtles *throughout the whole Hiſtory of the Acts.* For I told you juſt now of the *Election* of St *Mathias*, which was the firſt Thing done by the *Apoſtles* after our Saviours *Aſcenſion*; and wherein St *Peter* acted as *Head* according to St *Chryſoſtom's* Obſervation: And I do not find it mention'd in the *Acts*, that when St *Paul* was call'd to the *Apoſtleſhip*, St *Peter* either *abdicated*, or was *depoſed* by his *Fellow-Apoſtles.*

» *G.* My Lord, your Divines can find no other » Way to get ſome *Superiority* to St *Peter* in this » *Council* than to ſuppoſe that he open'd it, becauſe

as they ſay, he ſpoke firſt; which would not infer « the *Supremacy* they pretend, if it were true. But it « is plainly otherwiſe. For it is ſaid, Act. 15. v. 7. « *And when there had been much Diſputing, Peter roſe* « *up, and ſaid*, &c. Nor did he ſpeak laſt. For after « he had done, *Paul* and *Barnabas* declared the Con- « verſion of the *Gentiles* by their Means without « putting them under the *Law*, which was the Point « in debate. And after they had held their Peace, « St *James*, who was Bishop of *Jeruſalem*, where the « *Council* was held, did, as *Preſident*, reſume what « had been ſaid by St *Peter* and others, and gave his « Definitive Sentence upon the whole, *wherefore my* « *Sentence is.* And the Decree of the Council was « drawn up in the Words of St *James*. So that it is « plain he cloſed the *Council*, whoever open'd it, or « ſpoke firſt, which is not ſo material as to be told « in this Account of that *Council*. But Diſmiſſing the « *Council*, and putting an End to it, ſeems of grea- « ter *Authority*. If what is here ſaid of St *James* had « been ſaid of St *Peter*, I queſtion not it would have « been made Uſe of as a full Proof of his *Supremacy*, « and *Preſiding* in the *Council*. pag. 8. 9. «

L. Sr, *your not Queſtioning* and *my not Queſtioning* are of equal Weight; that is, none at all. Let us then conſider the Merits of the Cauſe, which is more to the Purpoſe.

All you have ſaid centers in this one Point, *viz.* that it was not St *Peter*, but St *James*, who *preſided* in the *Council*; which to the beſt of my Judgment cannot be made evident from the *Acts*.

You ſay St *Peter* neither ſpoke *firſt* nor *laſt*. that's more than either you or I can tell. For St *Luke* has let neither of us into the Secret. 'Tis certain St *Peter's* Diſcourſe is firſt recorded. But you anſwer, that before St *Peter* ſpoke, *there had been much Diſputing*,

Act. 15. ℣. 7. Very right. But I ask, who open'd that Debate?

G. St *Luke* is ſilent as to that Particular.

L. Is he ſo, Sr? And how then have you the Aſſurance to tell me, it is plain from the *Acts*, that St *Peter* did not open the *Council*? In Effect, St *Luke* has left us in the Dark, and St *Peter* may have open'd it as *Preſident* for ought we know. Therefore it is not evident from the *Acts*, that he was not the Man.

But you have a ſecond String to your Bow. *viz.* that tho St *Peter* ſhould be allow'd to have *open'd* the Council, it is plain to you, that St *James cloſed* it. But it is not ſo very plain to me: neither can it be ſo to you from the Hiſtory of the *Acts*. 'Tis true, St *James's* Diſcourſe is recited laſt by St *Luke*: But where do's he tell us, that none of the Apoſtles ſpoke after him? St *Luke* relates not a Word of what was ſaid before St *Peter's* Speech; and yet it is plain a great Deal was ſpoke before it. Beſides it is certain, that St *John* the *Evangeliſt* was at the *Council*: and St *Chryſoſtom* Hom. 33. in Act. doubts not but there were other Apoſtles beſides; yet not a ſingle Word is ſpecified of what they ſaid. And muſt we then conclude they ſate like Mutes, when the Faith of the Church was concern'd? It is not natural to ſuppoſe it.

You ſay, St *James* reſumed as *Preſident* what St *Peter* had ſaid. But why as *Preſident*? That's Begging the Queſtion: For any Man may reſume what another has ſaid before him without Acting as *Preſident*, and others for ought we know reſumed after St *James* what he had ſaid. In Effect, it was not St *Luke's* Buſineſs to gratify the Reader's Curioſity with what every body ſaid, or who ſpoke *firſt* or *laſt*, or who *preſided*; but to come the ſhorteſt

to the grand Point, that is, the Decree re-
to the Matter under Debate: becauſe that was
Juſtification of his Maſter St *Paul.*

But, My Lord, St *James* pronounced the *De-*
Sentence. For he ſaid *therefore my Sentence is.*

Sr, I anſwer *firſt*, this is an unfair Tranſla-
f the *Greek*, which is the *Original Text.* For
Greek is the ſame as *Judico* in *Latin*, and ſo
nder'd by St *Jerom*, which imports the ſame as
ames had ſaid, *this is my Judgment* or *Opinion.*
I find it likewiſe in an old *French Proteſtant*
ation of the *Bible* put forth anno 1540. where
ender'd thus, *pour laquelle choſe je ſuis d'avis*,
hich is no more a *definitive Sentence* than what
r had pronounced before him in theſe Words,
ore why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Neck
Diſciples, which neither our Fathers, nor we were
bear? Act. 15. ℣. 10. for there he plainly deli-
his Opinion.

ſuppoſe your Tranſlation of the Text were
as it is not, how can you make St *James's*
, therefore my Sentence is, a Proof of his *Preſi-*
For ſurely you will not Queſtion but every
in a *Council* has a *Definitive Vote*, and may
is is my Sentence. Therefore ſince every *Apoſtle*
op preſent at the *Council* of *Jeruſalem* had an
oted Right to give a *Definitive Sentence*, it can
Proof of any one's *Preſiding.*

My Lord, St *James* alſo diſmiſs'd the *Council*,
t an End to it, which is an Act of Autho-

This more, Sr, than you can make out from
ds. For after the End of his Speech St *Luke*
thus. *Then pleaſed it the Apoſtles and Elders*
whole Church to ſend choſen Men of their own
y to Antioch *with* Paul *and* Barnabas, &c.

Act. 15. v. 22. Whence it rather appears, that when the Buſineſs, upon which they had met was ended, they parted by mutual Conſent: and there is not the leaſt Hint given, that they were diſmiſs'd by St *James*, or indeed by any Single Perſon acting as *President* of the *Council*.

G. However, My Lord, it ſeems very ſurprizing the *Acts* ſhould be ſo ſilent concerning St *Peter's Supremacy*, ſince it is a Point of that importance.

L. Why ſo, Sr? Muſt the *Scriptures* ſay every Thing in every Place? Or is it ſo Surprizing that an Hiſtorian ſhould omit Things foreign to his main Deſign? St *Peter's Supremacy* is ſufficiently eſtabliſh'd in other Parts of *Scripture*, and it needs not be repeated in every Chapter. But pray, Sr, in what Chapter of the New Teſtament is the *ſpiritual Supremacy* of the *ſecular Prince* mention'd? Let me tell you, Sr, this is an ugly Queſtion, and ſo I will not preſs it.

But if the negative Argument, you inſiſt ſo much upon, be a Demonſtration (as you call it) againſt St *Peter's Supremacy*, then, Sr, all the following Articles, *viz.* the Validity of *Infant-Baptiſm* againſt *Anabaptiſts*, the Lawfulneſs of tranſlating the *Sabbath-day* to *Sunday* againſt the *Jews*, the *Divine Revelation* of all the *Canonical* Books of *Scripture* againſt the *Deiſts*, and ſeveral other Articles of great Importance have, according to your Way of Arguing, *Demonſtrations* againſt them: becauſe the *Scriptures* are not only very barren, but wholly *ſilent* in the Determination of theſe Points. Nay *Eating Blood* will be as criminal as *Fornication*: becauſe both are equally prohibited by St *James's* definitive Sentence in the *Council* of *Jeruſalem*: and there is not a Word on Record, by which this Prohibition was ever revoked.

The

The Truth of the whole Matter is this. The ſhort Relation given by St *Luke* of the *Council* at *Jeruſalem* affords no Argument of any Weight either *for* or *againſt* the *Supremacy* of St *Peter*. But you are willing to make the beſt of a bad Market, and play ſmall Game rather than ſtick out. The *Current* of *Antiquity* is againſt you; and ſo are the two Texts of St *Mathew* and St *John*. This puts you under a Neceſſity of Picking up ſomething to counterbalance as well as you can the Evidence of thoſe two Texts.

§. 7.

Other Objections anſwer'd.

G. MY Lord, none of thoſe *Texts* are ſo expreſs as thoſe I have quoted of St *Paul*. « pag. 6. «

L. Tis very ſtrange then that ſo many of the *Ancient Fathers* ſhould alledge thoſe *two Texts* for St *Peter's* Supremacy, and not one ſingle *Father* ſhould take Notice of thoſe you have quoted for St *Paul*.

G. My Lord, if the Texts you boaſt of were « meant in that Extent, for which you have pro- « duced them, it is impoſſible, but that muſt ap- « pear in the *Facts* of St *Peter*, eſpecially in the Part « he bore in the *Council* at *Jeruſalem*, and *Facts* are « the ſureſt Explanation of *Words*. pag. 9. «

L. Then, Sr, the very firſt *Fact* of the *Apoſtles* related by St *Luke* Act. 1. I mean, the *Election* of St *Mathias* decides the Queſtion againſt you. For 'tis manifeſt to any unbyaſs'd Reader, that St *Peter* acted in that important Occaſion as *Head* of the whole Aſſembly. Hear the Words of St *Chryſoſtom* once more; they carry Weight, and cannot be repeated too often. *See* (ſays he) *how he acknowledges the Flock*

entruſted to him. He is the Prince of the Choire. He had Reaſon to act here the firſt of all with Authority, having them all deliver'd into his Hands. Here, Sr, is an undeniable Fact. Whereas the Fact, you boaſt ſo much of, amounts to no more, than that St *Luke* (who has omitted innumerable other Facts) has not declared in expreſs Terms, either that St *Peter* did or did not *preſide* in the *Council* at *Jeruſalem:* which in Reality was not a material Circumſtance in the Subject of that Hiſtorical Paſſage. How *unjuſt* are prejudic'd *Men in their Balances!*

But there are ſome other Things very remarkable in the Scriptures. 1. That whenever the Apoſtles are named together St *Peter* is always named in the firſt Place. 2. That after the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* he was the firſt that ſignaliz'd himſelf in a Sermon to the *Jews;* and when the *Apoſtles* were reflected upon by the People, he ſtood up and undertook their Defence. *Act.* 2. *3dly.* He wrought the firſt Miracle in Confirmation of the *Goſpel.* Act. 3. *4thly.* He was the firſt, that preach'd it to the *Gentiles.* Act. 10. And *5thly.* He was the firſt, to whom their *Vocation* was reveal'd. *ibid.*

Theſe, Sr, are *Facts*, and very conſiderable ones in a Narrative, which was not intended for a Hiſtory of St *Peter's* Life, but of St *Paul's.* And tho they be not demonſtrative Proofs of St *Peter's Supremacy*, yet they contain Circumſtances, which very much corroborate the poſitive *Texts* for it, and naturally lead an impartial Reader to an idea of it.

» *G.* My Lord, we diſcourſe now only of *Autho-*
» *rity.* What *Authority* one *Apoſtle* had over ano-
» ther. For that is the Point, wherein we are con-
» cern'd. *pag.* 9.

L. Very right, Sr.

» *G.* We ſpeak not of other *Gifts* and *Graces*, of

their Labours in Propagating the *Goſpel*, wherein « one might be more eminent and ſucceſsful than « another. But this gave no *Authority* over the others. « *pag.* 9. «

L. All this is very true.

G. But in this alſo St *Paul* had the Preference. « For *he labour'd more abundantly than all.* 1. Cor. 15. « ℣. 10. And all the *Epiſtles* almoſt are his to the ſe- « veral Churches. And his *Miracles* and *Converſions* « of Infidels take up a much greater Part in the *Acts* « *of the Apoſtles* than thoſe of St *Peter*. pag. 9. 10. «

L. A moſt wonderful Diſcovery! That the Actions of a Perſon, whoſe Life is expreſsly writ, should take up the greateſt Part in ſuch a Hiſtory! But to convince you, Sr, from your own Principle, that this cannot be wreſted into any Argument for the Leſſening of St *Peter*; 'tis your Opinion that all the *Apoſtles* were equal; yet ſeven of the twelve are but once named in the *Acts*; and not one particular Action of theirs is related by St *Luke*, thô his Book be entitled *the Acts of the Apoſtles*. Either therefore your Mentioning, that the Actions of St *Paul* take up the greateſt Part in thoſe *Acts* is a trifling Obſervation; or, if it has any Force againſt St *Peter*, we muſt conclude, that the greateſt Number of the Apoſtles were meer *Cyphers* in the Opinion of St *Luke*.

G. My Lord, I have ſaid ſo much of this Mat- « ter, becauſe the ſuppoſed *Suppremacy* of St *Peter*, « his being at *Rome*, and *Biſhop* of *Rome*, is the whole « Foundation of that *Supremacy* claim'd by the *Biſhop* « and *Church* of *Rome*. And if that be ſo eſſential a « Point, and upon which the *Unity* of the *Church* « depend's, in ſo much that without it there is no « *Church* at all according to the Scheme drawn by « modern *Rome*, it is inconceivable the *Scriptures* «

» should be ſo wholly ſilent in it; nay shewing the » very contrary in Fact, as I have ſaid already con- » cerning St *Peter*. pag. 10.

L. Sr, *Saying* and *Proving* are two very different Things. You have *ſaid* it indeed, but you have no Reaſon to boaſt of it, unleſs a good Aſſurance be a Virtue. I grant then that the *Supremacy* of St *Peter* is an *eſſential Point*, and it is clearly determined by the *Word of God*, if plain *Words* and *Facts* may be depended upon. The *Scriptures* therefore are not *ſilent* in it. But it is your Miſtake, and not our Doctrine, that St *Peter's being at Rome*, and *Bishop of Rome* are any Part of the *eſſential* Point of his *Supremacy*. For, tho the Facts be as unqueſtionable, as any hiſtorical Facts can be, yet neither St *Peter's Supremacy*, nor that of his *Succeſſors* has any Dependence upon them. Becauſe St *Peter* would have been *Head* of the *Church*, tho he had never been at *Rome*: and his *Succeſſors* would be the ſame, and have the ſame *Authority*, tho he had choſen any other City for his Epiſcopal ſee.

» *G.* My Lord, when the *direct Queſtion* was put » to our *bleſſed Saviour* upon the Conteſt among the » Apoſtles, *which of them should be the greateſt*. Luke » 22. *v.* 24. I ſay, if this was ſo material a Point, » as to the very *Being* of the *Church*, it is inconcei- » vable he ſhould not have determined it, but by » his Anſwer rather checkt the Error of their » Thoughts, and left them all upon the level. *pag.* 10.

L. Sr, I have but three Things to ſay to this Objection. 1. You have miſrepreſented the *Text*. 2. Tho I ſhould allow it to be fairly repreſented, it can render you no Manner of Service, and 3. the *Context* is againſt you.

1. The *Text* is thus. *And there was alſo a Strife among them, which of them should be accounted the gre-*

teſt. Luke 22. ℣. 24. Here indeed we are plainly told, that there was a Conteſt *among themſelves*, but not a Word of any *direct Queſtion* put to our *bleſſed Saviour*; and is it then ſo very unconceivable that there ſhould be no *direct Anſwer*, when no *direct Queſtion* was put?

2. But ſuppoſe the *direct Queſtion* had been put to our *Saviour*, is it ſo very unconceivable, that he ſhould not take that Occaſion to determine the Matter? For was not *Chriſt* fitteſt to Judge, what Time was moſt proper to place a *Superiour* over his *Apoſtles*, as he did in Effect not long before his *Aſcenſion?* Joh. 21. ℣. 15. 16. &c. Or was he bound to gratify their Ambitious Curioſity with a poſitive Determination upon the very Spot? On the contrary they deſerved even a ſeverer Check, than he gave them. However it was perfectly adapted to the Nature of their Fault. For inſtead of Determining their Conteſt, he gave them a Lecture of *Humility* to cure them of their *Pride*. Yet at the ſame Time he inſinuated very plainly, that there was to be a *Superiour* amongſt them; thô he did not think fit to nominate the Perſon at that Time. Which makes good what I ſaid

3. That the *Context* is againſt you. Our *Saviour's* Words are theſe. *And he ſaid unto them, the Kings of the Gentiles exerciſe Lordſhip over them; and they that exerciſe Authority upon them, are call'd Benefactors. But ye ſhall not be ſo. But he, that is* GREATEST *among you, let him be as the Younger, and he that is* CHIEF, *as he that do's ſerve.* Luke 22. ℣. 25. 26. Is not this a clear inſinuation that there was to be a *Chief* among them, join'd with an Inſtruction, with what *Humility* he was to behave himſelf? So that the *Text* you have quoted, makes nothing againſt St *Peter's Supremacy*, and it's Context makes for it. Unleſs you

can name me ſome other appointed by *Chriſt* to be the *Head* of his *Church*, and *Center* of *Unity*; For there is but *one Church* of *Chriſt* upon Earth.

§. 8.

The Church's Unity, *and* Supremacy *of the* Pope.

» *G.* YOur Lordship may add, and in *Heaven* too: » For all are *one Church* to *Chriſt*, of which » he alone is the *Head*. And one Part being *mili-* » *tant*, the other *Triumphant*, makes them not *two* » *Churches*, but two *States* of the ſame *Church*, which » is call'd *one Family in Heaven and Earth*, Eph. 3. » ℣. 15. In like Manner *Heaven*, *Earth*, and *Hell* » are one *Kingdom* to the great *Creator*; for *his King-* » *dom ruleth over All*. And of the *Earth* it is ſaid, » *The Kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the Governour* » *among the Nations*. Pſ. 22. ℣. 28. All the *Nations* » are *one Kingdom* to him. *pag.* 11.

L. Sr, no Man doubts, but the *Church Militant* and *Triumphant* are but *one Church* to *Chriſt*, who is the ſole *Supreme* and *independent*, but *inviſible Head* of the *Church Militant* upon Earth. But the Queſtion between us is, whether he has not deputed a *Viſible Head* to govern this *Church* under him?

» *G.* My Lord, he has appointed no *Univerſal* » *Monarch* as his *deputy* of his *Kingdom* of the Earth. » But each Nation is govern'd by their reſpective » *Rulers*, who are independent of each other. For » ſo his Wiſdom has diſpoſed according to the Ca- » pacity of his Creatures. For what Man would be » ſufficient to govern the whole World? And where » muſt the *Seat* be of this *Univerſal Monarch*? Muſt » he not have as many or more *Deputies* under him, » as there are now *Kings* or *Nations*? And what Pru-

dence could prevent Defections and Rebellions in « far diſtant Provinces? This has overthrown great « Monarchies, which have fallen with their own « Weight. What then could ſupport an *Univerſal* « *Monarchy?* When Nations go to War, other « Neighbouring *Kings* and *States* may interpoſe, or « aſſiſt the oppreſſed by *Mediators* and *Guarantees* of « Peace. But this could not be in Caſe of Defection « from the *Univerſal Monarch.* For who aſſiſt *Rebels*, « are *Rebels* themſelves: And ſuch Wars could not « but end in the utter Deſtruction of the one Side « or the other. Therefore God has conſulted beſt « for the Peace and Safety of Mankind in Diſtribu- « ting the World into ſeveral independent Govern- « ments, rather than put all under the Dominion « of one. *pag.* 11. 12. «

L. Sr, you have taken a great Deal of Pains to prove a Thing, which no Man ever denied. *viz.* that God has not eſtabliſh'd an *Univerſal Monarchy* or *Monarch* upon Earth. And therefore tho the ſeveral *Kingdoms* upon Earth be *one Kingdom* to *God*, yet they are not *One* among themſelves, even when in *Peace*, but much leſs when they are at *War.*

G. My Lord, the *Unity* of *Kingdoms* is indeed « diſturb'd, when they are at *War*; but it is not to- « tally diſſolved. For there are *Laws* of War, where- « in all agree. There is ſtill what we call the *Law* « *of Nations*, which as it maintains Commerce in « Peace, ſo it regulates the Fury of War. And there « is one *Unity*, which nothing can diſſolve; that is, « *God having made of one Blood all Nations upon the* « *Earth.* So that here is an *Unity* of *Relation*, of *Hu-* « *manity*, and of *common Principles*, which all retain. « *pag.* 12. «

L. However an *Unity*, which do's not hinder People from cutting one another's Throats, is but a very ſlen- der one.

» *G.* It is not as it should be; but it is so as is » consistent with our *fallen State*, and the Corrup- » tions of Mankind. It is not such an *Unity*, as is » in God's Kingdom in *Heaven*, which yet was once » disturb'd by *Rebellion.* pag. 12.

L. But, Sr, the *Rebels* were banish'd out of *Heaven*; and so all *Hereticks*, who are *Rebels* against the *Church*, are cut off from her *Communion.* For 'tis as impossible for *Hereticks* to be Members of *Christ's Church Militant* upon Earth, as for the *Devil*, and his *Apostate Angels* to be Members of the *Church Triumphant* in Heaven. But, surely, Sr, you will allow a *stricter Unity* in the *Church* of *Christ* upon Earth, than there is among *Nations*, that are at *War* with one another?

» *G.* I wish it were so. But alas it is not. And » the Frailty of Man shews itself in the *Church*, as » well as in the *State.* The many *Heresies* and *Divi-* » *sions* in the *Church* have rent her to Pieces, and » broke her *Unity* as much as *Wars* have that of the » *temporal* World. *pag.* 12.

L. Is it then possible, that there should be no greater *Unity* in the *Church* of *Christ*, than there is among *Kingdoms*, that are Tearing and Devouring one another! If this be all the *Unity* we are capable of in our fallen State, then the *Church of Christ* is a meer *Babel*, and his *Kingdom* a Realm of Confusion.

You say, *the many Heresies, that are in the Church, have rent her to Pieces.* If you mean, Sr, that they have torn many Limbs off from her, I grant it. But they remain not *in* the *Catholick Church:* They are cast out of her, as *Lucifer* and his *Apostate Angels* were cast out of *Heaven:* and she remains truly *One* (or else the *Nicene Creed* deceives us) that is, *One* in *Faith*; *One* in the Participation of *Sacraments*; and *One*

in

in the Union of all her Members under *One Visible Head, Christ's Vicar* upon Earth. So that they, who by their Pride, and Obstinacy separated themselves from this *Head*, to which they were once united, are accountable to God for the *Divisions*, you complain of.

G. No, My Lord, it is the Pretence to *universal Supremacy* in the *Church of Rome* has been the « great Cause of these *Divisions*. It has procured Peace « in the *Church* just as setting up an *Universal Mo-* « *narchy* would in the *World*, that is, fill'd it with « more Confusion and Bloodshed, than ever was in « it, or could otherwise possibly be. For which « Reason God has appointed no *Universal Monarch* « in the *Church* more than in the *State*. pag. 13. «

L. To speak properly, Sr, the *Pope*, as such, is no *Monarch* at all, much less the *Universal One*. The Reason is, because the Word *Monarch* is properly taken for *One*, to whom all others placed in Authority are but as *Vicars*, *Deputies*, or *Vice-Regents*. In which Sense *Christ* is the only *Universal Monarch* both of the *World*, and the *Church*. For all *Bishops* are his *Vicars*, and all *Princes* his *Vice-Regents*. And this cannot be attributed to the *Pope*. But I am sensible that *Universal Monarch* is an odious Name, and therefore very proper to supply the Want of Argument against the *Pope's Supremacy*; which in Reality means no more, than that he is the Supreme Visible Governour of the whole *Church* of *Christ*.

If therefore you pretend to maintain, that the *Pope's Supremacy*, or his being chief Governour of the *Catholick* or *Universal* Church, is as improper an Expedient to procure it's *Unity* and *Peace*, as a Man's Setting himself up for *Universal Monarch* would be to establish *Peace* in the *World*, I can see nothing but a meer Jingle of Words to support the Com-

pariſon, and the difference is obvious to common Senſe.

Firſt, becauſe the Strength of the *Civil Government* conſiſts in *Money*, *Arms*, and *Men*; which cannot be eaſily diſpatch'd to all Parts of the World. But *Church government* ſtands quite upon another Bottom. *The Weapons of our Warfare* (ſays St *Paul*, 2. Cor. 10. ℣. 4. 6.) *are not carnal, but mighty through Chriſt. And having in a Readineſs to revenge all Diſobedience.* Theſe are *Cenſures*, *Excommunications*, *Suſpenſions*, *Depoſitions*, *Interdicts*, *&c.* which neither diſtance nor Oppoſition renders ineffectual, but have their Force in the *Court of Conſcience*, which it is in vain to oppoſe.

2. Tis certain God has not eſtabliſh'd an *Univerſal Monarchy*, in the World: and therefore any Man's ſetting himſelf up for *Univerſal Monarch* muſt of Neceſſity cauſe Oppoſition, and Bloodshed. But it is no leſs certain, that *Chriſt* has eſtabliſh'd an *Univerſal Church*. For what do's the Word *Catholick* elſe mean? It means undoubtedly, that the *Church* of *Chriſt* is not limited to this or that Nation in particular, but is the *Church* of all Nations according to Scripture-language, *go ye and teach all Nations*, Math. 28. ℣. 19. And therefore as there is but *one Church* in all the Nations of the World, where the true Faith is received, ſo Chriſt was pleaſed to appoint *one Head* for the Government of it.

§. 9.

St Gregory's *Judgment relating to the Matter under Debate.*

G. MY Lord, *Gregory* the *Great* ſaid to *John* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* (who upon the

Seat of the Empire being tranſlated thither ſet up « for an *Univerſal Supremacy* in the Church) *if the « Church ſhould come to depend upon one, it muſt ſuddenly « fall.* And *Cyprian.*------ pag. 13.

L. Hold, Sr, let me anſwer this firſt. You are under a very great, and I fear a wilful Miſtake in ſaying that *John* Bishop of *Conſtantinople*, ſet up for the *Univerſal Supremacy* in the Church.

Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius will juſtify what I ſay. For in the Preface to his *Latin* Tranſlation of the 7th General Council addreſs'd to Pope *John* the 8th, he writes thus. *Being at Conſtantinople I often blamed the Greeks for this Title* [viz. *Oecumenical*, or *Univerſal* Patriarch] *as a Mark of Pride or Arrogancy, to which they anſwer'd, that they did not call their Patriarch* Oecumenical, *as if he had the Primacy of all the World, but that he was over a Part inhabited by Chriſtians.* Meaning the *Eaſtern* Church. *Non quod univerſi orbis teneat Præſulatum, ſed quod cuidam parti præſit orbis, quæ à Chriſtianis inhabitatur.* Tom. 7. Conc. pag. 30.

'Tis certain therefore, that the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch*, which *John* of *Conſtantinople* aſſumed, was underſtood by him, and the other *Greeks* in a very innocent Senſe, and only ſignified, that he was the *firſt Patriarch* of the *Eaſt:* as Monſieur du *Pin*, likewiſe teſtifies Cen. 6. pag. 67. where he tells us, *That John of Capadocia ſirnamed the Faſter was sharply reprehended by St Gregory for taking upon him the Title of Oecumenical Patriarch. Becauſe this Pope look'd upon his Title as a Mark of Ambition, tho in the Senſe of the Greeks it was Innocent, and ſignified nothing leſs than what St Gregory thought.*

However as that *Saint* underſtood it, the Title was unjuſtifiable on ſeveral Accounts. *Firſt*, becauſe it ſeem'd to import a *Juriſdiction* over the whole

Church, which did not belong to the Bishop of *Conſtantinople*, nor was indeed chalenged by him. And *2dly*, becauſe it ſeem'd to import that he was the *only Bishop*, or, at leaſt, that all other Bishops were his *Deputies*; A Dignity belonging to *Chriſt* alone. 'Tis manifeſt at leaſt that St *Gregory* underſtood it ſo; as appears from his own Writings, and particularly his Words to the Empreſs *Conſtantina*, to whom he complains thus. *'Tis a lamentable Thing* (ſays he) *to be forced to bear, that my Brother and Fellow-Bishop John deſpiſing all others, endeavours to be call'd the only Bishop.* L. 5. Ep. 21.

Now then let us conſider the Words, you pretend to quote from him. viz. *If the Church should come to depend upon one, it muſt ſuddenly fall.* But, Sr, his true Words are theſe. *Univerſa ergo Eccleſia, quod abſit, a ſtatu ſuo corruit, quando is qui vocatur Univerſalis cadit*; which I think ought to be english'd thus. *Wherefore the Univerſal Church (which God forbid) falls from it's State, when he, who is call'd Univerſal, falls.* L. 5. Epiſt. 20. *laſt Paris-Edition.* Now tho this Paſſage may be ſaid to have ſome Reſemblance with the Words you have quoted the Senſe of it is very different, and true enough as St *Gregory* underſtood the Title aſſumed by *John* of *Conſtantinople*. For if there were but *one Bishop* in the Church, and he fell into *Hereſy*, the whole *Epiſcopal Order*, and *Prelatick Church* would fall with him. But what is this to the *Pope?* For tho the whole Church be govern'd by him, and by Conſequence *depends on him* in that Senſe, how can it be true, that if he ſhould fall, the whole Church would fall with him? We may as well ſay: that if he dies, the whole Church muſt die with him.

G. But what do you ſay to theſe Words of St *Gregory*. L. 6. Epiſt. 30. ad Imperat. *I boldly affirm,*

that whoſoever calls himſelf univerſal Bishop, or deſires to be call'd ſo by others, shews himſelf by ſuch his Haughtineſs to be a Forerunner of Antichriſt, in as much as he proudly advances himſelf above all others.

L. I anſwer, that the Title of *Univerſal Bishop*, as St *Gregory* underſtood it, was a Title of *Pride* and *Blaſphemy*. And if *John* of *Conſtantinople* had aſſumed it in that Senſe, he might have been properly call'd a Forerunner of *Antichriſt*. For all *Hereticks* are call'd *Antichriſts* by St *John*. 1. Joh. 2. ℣. 18. And St *Jerom* Epiſt. 57. gives the ſame Title to all, that wilfully ſeparate themſelves from St *Peter's Chair*; which would have been the Caſe of *John* of *Conſtantinople*.

The Truth of the whole Matter is, St *Gregory* was a very humble Man, and the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop* or *Patriarch* ſeem'd to him too pompous and haughty to be aſſumed by any Man. It was certainly capable of a double Meaning, and he took it in the worſt, and in that Senſe oppoſed it with all his Zeal: And, to ſet others a Pattern of Humility, he choſe to ſtile himſelf *the Servant of the Servants of God*. But did that hinder him from Aſſerting the *Supremacy* either of St *Peter*, or of his own *See*, which is the Point, we have now under Examination? He was ſo far from it, that he maintain'd both the one and the other with the greateſt Vigour.

Firſt, as to the *Supremacy* of St *Peter*, in the very Time of his Diſpute with *John* of *Conſtantinople* he wrote thus. *It is evident to all, that know the Goſpel, that the Care of the whole Church was by our Lord's Voice committed to the Apoſtle St Peter Prince of the Apoſtles. For to him it is ſaid*, Peter loveſt thou me, feed my Sheep. *To him it is ſaid*, thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it. *Behold the Care and Primacy of the whole Church is committed*

to him, and yet he is not call'd the Univerſal Apoſtle. And my holy Brother and Fellow-Biſhop John endeavours to be call'd univerſal Biſhop. Lib. 5. Epiſt. 20. p. 748. ult. Edit. This I think is a plain Deciſion of what St *Gregory* thought of St *Peter's Supremacy.*

As to the *Supremacy* of his own *See* let us alſo hear this great Man ſpeak for himſelf. *Firſt*, (Lib. 11. Epiſt. 56. Vet. Edit.) he writes thus concerning a Biſhop, who pretended to be exempt from the *Juriſdiction* of his *Metropolitan*: *If it be pretended that the Biſhop has neither a Metropolitan, nor Patriarch, I anſwer, that then his Cauſe is to be heard and decided by the See Apoſtolick, which is the Head of all Churches.* This ſurely is plain and deciſive.

But 2dly, he writes thus to the Biſhop of *Syracuſa*. *As to what they write of the Church of Conſtantinople who doubts but that it is ſubject to the See Apoſtolick?* Lib. 9. Epiſt. 59. p. 976. Now *Conſtantinople* was neither under the *Roman Biſhop* at it's *Metropolitan*, nor as it's *Patriarch*: Since therefore St *Gregory* thought it ſubject to him, he muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe his *See* had a Spiritual *Supremacy* over the whole Church.

Laſtly, if this had not been his Judgment, how could he pretend to give to St *Auſtin* the firſt Biſhop of *Canterbury* that *Juriſdiction*, which the *See* of *Canterbury* ſtill chalenges over all the *Britiſh Biſhops?* This one Action ſpeaks his Thoughts more clearly, than any Words whatſoever. And I hope you will not accuſe him of *Tyranny* and *Uſurpation*, ſince Dr *Barrow*, your great Champion againſt the *Supremacy*, ſtiles him a *Prudent*, *Meek*, and *Humble* Man, pag. 18. And is it not then a moſt ſurprizing Diſcovery, that ſuch a zealous Advocate for the *Supremacy* is at length found out to be an Enemy to it! Or rather do's it not plainly ſhew, how deſtitute you are of Friends amongſt the *Fathers*, when the

very Perſon, whom you pretend to bring in as a chief Evidence for you has profeſs'd himſelf both by Words and Actions to be a moſt zealous Defender of the Cauſe, you oppoſe!

But pray take Notice, Sr, that the Queſtion now between us is not, what Weight St *Gregory's* Authority has with you, or any other *Proteſtant*; But what his Opinion was concerning the *Supremacy*; for you pretend he is on the *Proteſtant Side.* 'Tis therefore impertinent to anſwer (as a certain Friend of your's do's) that a Pope ſpeaks here for himſelf. For whether St *Gregory* was *Pope*, or *no Pope* is nothing to the Purpoſe: But if it be plain Matter of Fact, that he maintain'd the *Supremacy* both of St *Peter* and his *Succeſſors*, the Queſtion is fully decided againſt you. So you may proceed now if you pleaſe to what you were going to ſay concerning St *Cyprian.*

§. 10.

St Cyprian's *Judgment relating to the Subject under Debate.*

G. ST *Cyprian* ſaid that *Chriſt therefore made the* « *College of Biſhops numerous, that if one ſhould* « *fall, or turn Heretical the reſt might interpoſe for the* « *Saving of the Flock.* «

L. Well, what then?

G. He alſo ſays, *there is but one Flock, and one* « *Epiſcopat, of which every Biſhop has the whole in Part-* « *nerſhip with the reſt.* Epiſcopatus unus eſt, cujus à « ſingulis in ſolidum Pars tenetur. This was the Frame « of the *Church* in his Days, and before from the « *Apoſtles.* This was the very State of the *Apoſtles* « themſelves, who thus ſhared the *Apoſtolat*, the whole « of which was given to each in Partnerſhip or in « Common with the reſt. *pag.* 13. «

L. Sr, 'tis certain, there is but one *Epiſcopacy*; that is, but one *Epiſcopal Order* or *Character*, which is common to all. For one Bishop is as truly Biſhop as another; tho their *Juriſdictions* be divided, and many Times ſubordinate to one another, and all under one Head.

And this was truly the Frame of the Church in St *Cyprian's* Days, and even from the Time of the *Apoſtles*; who, tho they were equal to St *Peter* in the *Apoſtolate* (as all *Bishops* are in their *Epiſcopal Character* to the *Pope*) yet were nor left like *Independents* without a *Head*. And ſo it is beyond my Compreheniion, how St *Cyprian's* Words can do you any Manner of Service.

G. St *Cyprian* ſaid to his Bishops preſent in the Council of *Carthage*. *None of us makes himſelf Biſhop of Bishops, or compels his Collegues by a Tyrannical Power to a Neceſſity of Obeying. Seeing every Bishop is at his own Diſpoſal upon the Account of his Liberty and Power, and can no more be Judged by another, than he can Judge another.*

L. Surely, Sr, you don't imagine it was St *Cyprian's* Opinion, that there is no Subordination of any one Bishop to another, of *Dioceſans*, for Example, to their *Metropolitan* or *Primate?* And if that be not his Meaning, to what Purpoſe have you produced his Words? But let St *Auſtin* give the direct Anſwer. *I ſuppoſe* (ſays he) *he meant in Queſtions of this kind, which are not fully and throughly diſcuſs'd. For he knew how perplex'd a Controverſy it was, which the Church was then Diſputing, and Canvaſſing on all Sides. And he gave free Liberty of Seeking, that by the Enquiry Truth might be diſcover'd.* L. 3. de Bap. C. 3.

Now the Queſtion, St *Auſtin* ſpeaks of, was concerning the *Rebaptization* of thoſe, who had been baptiz'd by *Heretick*s, which had been very warmly diſputed

liſputed between *Pope Stephen* and St *Cyprian*. And ince it was a Controverſy, in which the *Church* had ıot yet interpoſed her *Authority*, as she did afterwards, St *Cyprian* told the Bishops aſſembled at *Carthage*, that no one could be compell'd to recede from his own private Opinion, but all were free to examine the Matter, and deliver their Judgment upon it. And what do's that make againſt the *Pope's Supremacy?*

G. St *Cyprian* (de Unit. Eccl.) poſitively atteſts, *that what St Peter was, the ſame alſo were the Apoſtles, endued with a like Partnership of Honour and Power.*

L. But, Sr, why do you ſuppreſs both his foregoing Words, and thoſe that follow immediately after? I can ſee no other Reaſon for it, but becauſe they ſpoil your Market entirely. St *Cyprian's* Words immediately foregoing are theſe. *Yet Chriſt to shew the Unity of the Church order'd by his own Authority the Origine of that Unity beginning from one.* viz. St *Peter*, whom he mention'd juſt before. And his Words immediately following are theſe. *But the Beginning ſprings from an Unity, that the Church may be shew'd to be one.* Now joining all theſe together with the Words you have objected, St *Cyprian's* Meaning appears plainly to be this. *viz.* that thô all the *Apoſtles* were *equal* in the *Honour* and *Power* of the *Apoſtolate*, which we do not deny, yet for the Preſervation of *Unity*, *Chriſt* thought fit to make one of them the *Origine* or *Source* of *Unity* to all the reſt. Which inſtead of being an Objection againſt St *Peter's Supremacy*, is a Confirmation of it.

St *Cyprian* expreſſes himſelf in the ſame Manner in his Epiſtle to Pope *Cornelius*. Where taking Notice of the Boldneſs of certain *Schiſmaticks*, that fled to *Rome*, he writes thus. *Moreover they dare to paſs the Seas, and carry Letters from their Faction to the Chair*

of St Peter, and the principal Church, from which the Unity of Prieſthood is riſen. Epiſt. 55.

Here the *See* of *Rome* is both call'd the *Chair* of St *Peter*, and the *principal Church*, *from which the Unity of Prieſthood is riſen:* Which in the foregoing Paſſage he calls the *Origine* or *Source* of *Unity*. And pray, Sr, what Difference is there between theſe two Expreſſions, and Calling it the *Center of Unity?* I confeſs I am not ſubtle enough to diſtinguish between them. And 'tis a plain Caſe, that St *Cyprian* is as little in the *Proteſtant* Intereſt, as St *Gregory*.

§. 11.

The Belief of common Chriſtianity *is not a ſufficient* Unity of Faith.

BUt, Sr, it is no Wonder you should not ſee with St *Cyprian* the Neceſſity of a *ſupreme Head* to unite together all the Members of *Chriſt's Myſtical* Body, ſince according to the large Principle, you have laid down, there is no greater *Unity* in the *Church* than among *Nations*, that are at *War* together. So that as the *Unity* of the *World* conſiſts in the *Unity* of *Blood*, and the *common Principles*, which we call the *Law* of *Nations*, ſo in like Manner, according to your Syſtem, the *Unity* of the *Church* conſiſts in the *common Chriſtianity*, wherein all agree.

» *G.* Why, My Lord, is not every one, who » believes in *Chriſt* a *Chriſtian*, as every one, who » believes in *Mahomet* is a *Mahometan?* pag. 14.

L. Yes, Sr, but every one, who believes in *Chriſt*, is not a *Catholick Chriſtian*. For if he were, no *Chriſtian* could be an *Heretick*; and to believe in *Chriſt* would be the only *Article* of *Faith* requiſite to Salvation.

» *G.* No, My Lord, we muſt obey his *Commands*

lements too, which oblige us to live peaceably « and quietly as *Members* of that *Body* or *Church*, « whereto we appertain, with *Chriſtian* Love and Fel- « lowship with all others, and not to make *Schiſms* « and *Diviſions* by breaking *Communion*, where no- « thing ſinful is required as a Condition of it. And « when ſuch diſorderly Perſons are caſt out of the « *Church*, or cut themſelves off by a cauſeleſs *Separa-* « *tion*, tho they are no longer of the *Church*, yet they « ceaſe not to be *Chriſtians*, (that is a *noſtrum* of the « *Church* of *Rome*) and they muſt anſwer for their « *Schiſm* as for other Sins, all which are *damnable* in « their own Nature without *Repentance*: And yet Al- « lowances are made for invincible *Ignorance* occa- « ſion'd by the Prejudices of *Education*, *&c.* but not « for *Obſtinacy*. No Society of Men would bear ſuch « perverſe *Members* amongſt them. *pag.* 14. «

L. I fear, Sr, you have here pronounced the Condemnation not only of the *firſt Reformers*, who were the *Ringleaders* of the *Schiſm*, or *Separation* from their *Mother-Church*, but of all Men of Learning perſiſting in that *Schiſm*. For theſe can never plead *invincible Ignorance*.

As to what you inſinuate, that we take ourſelves to be the *only Chriſtians* in the World, is a groſs Miſtake. That is not *a Noſtrum of the Church of Rome*. For thô we take ourſelves to be the *only Catholicks*, we are but too fully convinced, that there are *heretical Chriſtians*, and *Chriſtian Hereticks*. What you add, viz. *that they, who are caſt out of the Church, or cut themſelves off by a cauſeleſs Separation, are no longer of the Church*; is moſt certainly true: But, Sr, you ramble from the principal Queſtion in your Anſwer to me. For the Queſtion, we have now upon the Anvil, is not whether *Love* and *Charity*, or *keeping the Commandements* be neceſſary to Salvation? This

no Man doubts of. But what Sort of *Faith* is neceſſary to Salvation? The Queſtion is, whether our *Belief* in *Chriſt alone* ſuffices to denominate us *Members* of the *true Church?*

» *G.* My Lord, A *Church* is a Society profeſſing » ſuch or ſuch a *Religion*, be it *true* or *falſe*. Thus » there is a *Church* of the *Jews*, of *Heathens*, of *Chri-* » *ſtians*, and *Mahometans*. And I would ask your » Lordship, which is any of theſe *Churches?* For » Inſtance, which is the Church of the *Mahometans?* » pag. 14. 15.

L. That's a puz'ling Queſtion indeed. However I venture to anſwer, that the *Church* of the *Mahometans* (ſince you will needs call it ſo) is a *Compound* or *aggregate* of all the ſeveral *Sects*, that Worship *Mahomet*.

» *G.* Yet there is no *chief Prieſt* over all theſe. » But every *Church* as *Nation* is *independent* of each » other. And thus among the ſeveral *Nations*, and » *Churches* of the *Heathens*. pag. 15.

L. Sr, when you convince me, that there is a Multiplicity either of *Sects* (as among *Mahometans*) or of *Gods* (as among *Heathens*) in the Communion of the *holy Catholick Church*, then it will be Time enough to provide *ſeveral Heads* to govern a *Body* compoſed of ſuch *oppoſite* and *Jarring* Members. But as long as there is but *one God* Worshipp'd, and but *one Faith* profeſs'd, *one Head* under *Chriſt* is as proper to govern his *Church*, as one *high Prieſt* under God was to govern the *Jewish Synagogue*.

» *G.* The *Jews* were but one Nation and a ſmall » one; therefore they had as *one King*, ſo one *high* » *Prieſt*. There was ſomething like this in that Part » of the *Chriſtian Church*, which was within the » *Roman Empire*. -----

L. Somewhat like it do you ſay, Sr! Really you make me ſmile. But pray go on.

G. But to extend the *Supremacy* of the Bishop « of *Rome* beyond the Limits of the *Emperor* of « *Rome*, even to all *Chriſtian Churches* in the World « is a Fancy never came into the Heads of any Mor- « tals; and is not neceſſary to denominate *many* « *Churches* profeſſing the ſame *Religion* to be *one* « *Church*. As of the *Heathens* and *Mahometans*, all « which are call'd the *Heathen*, or the *Mahometan* « *Church* or *Churches*, without any *common Head* over « them all. *pag.* 15. «

L. What Pity is it, that *Chriſtians* never thought of ſending an honourable Deputation to the *Heathen* and *Mahometan* Churches to receive from them ſome better *Model* of *Church-government*, than *Chriſt* has eſtabliſh'd! This indeed is a Fancy, which (God be praiſed) *never came into the Heads of any Mortals.* But it has been, I will not ſay the *Fancy*, but the *Faith* of all Ages, that the *Church of Chriſt*, tho never ſo far extended, even beyond the Limits of the Empire, never was but in *one Communion*, profeſſing *one Faith*, and united under *one Head*, according to Chriſt's own Inſtitution.

G. My Lord, there is not one Word in *Scrip-* « *ture* appointing ſuch an *Univerſal Head* in the *Chri-* « *ſtian Church*, or Altering the Common Senſe of « Mankind as to the Meaning of the Word *Church*, « or taking it in any other Senſe, than commonly « underſtood by all the World. *pag.* 15. «

L. What, Sr, is there not a Word in *Scripture* appointing a *Supreme Head* of the *Univerſal Church* of *Chriſt!* Then I preſume the 16th of St *Mathew* ℣. 18. and 21th of St *John* ℣. 15. 16. 17. are no Part of *Scripture.* For I have clearly ſhew'd a *ſupreme Paſtor* promiſed in the former, and eſtabliſh'd in the latter of thoſe Texts. 'Tis true indeed thoſe Texts have not *alter'd the Senſe of Mankind as to the*

Meaning of the Word Church, but on the contrary they have eſtablish'd it: And all *Orthodox Chriſtians*, that ever were in the World, have been convinced by them, that the *Church* of *Chriſt* cannot be but in *one Communion*, and that *Chriſt* appointed one *viſible Head* to govern her.

» *G.* My Lord, in our Way of ſpeaking, when » we ſay the *Fathers of the Church*, or the *primitive* » *Church*, we mean not any *particular Church*, but » the whole *Body* or *Church* of *Chriſtians*, tho divided » into many *Nations* or *Churches*. pag. 15. 16.

L. 'Tis true, Sr, we mean not any *particular Dioceſs*, or even *National Church*. Neither do we mean a ridiculous *Compound* of all Sorts of *Chriſtians*, whether *Orthodox*, *Heretick*s, or *Schiſmaticks*. But we mean preciſely the *whole Body* or *Church* of *Catholicks*: which, tho divided into many *Nations* or *Churches* are all in *one Communion*; that is, profeſs *one Faith*, and are united to, and govern'd by *one Head*, who is St *Peter's Succeſſor*, and Bishop of *Rome*.

» *G.* What! Were they united to the *Bishop* of » *Rome* before there was a *Church of Rome!* For there » were *Chriſtian Churches* before, as I have told you. » *pag.* 16.

L. No, Sr, but they were united to St *Peter* both before and after he was Bishop of *Rome*. And tho there were *Chriſtian Churches* before the particular *Church*, that is, the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, yet I think there was no *Chriſtian Church* more ancient that St *Peter*. And as the *Catholick Church* was in *Communion* with St *Peter* both before and after he was Bishop of *Rome*, ſo has she always been in Communion with his *Succeſſors*, who, as I told you, actually are, and have always been *Bishops* of *Rome*. Nay St *Cyprian* made no Difference between being in the Communion of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and the Communion of

the *Catholick Church*, for in his 52 letter to *Antonianus* he ſays, *a letter was writ to Pope* Cornelius *to let him know that you were in his Communion*, THAT IS, *in the Communion of the Catholick Church.*

G. Is not then the *whole Body* of *Chriſtians* truly and properly the *Church of Chriſt?*

L. Sr, the *whole Body* of *Orthodox* or *Catholick Chriſtians* is truly and properly the *Church of Chriſt.* But *Heretical* and *Schiſmatical Chriſtians* are Members cut off, and belong not to *Chriſt's Myſtical Body* the *Church.* As St *Auſtin* teaches in theſe expreſs Terms. *Nec hæretici pertinent ad Eccleſiam Catholicam, nec Schiſmatici* [de fide & Symbolo] that is, *neither hereticks nor Schiſmaticks belong to the Catholick Church.* And therefore we ſay not in the Creed, *I believe the Chriſtian*, but *I believe the Catholick Church.* For tho all *Catholicks* be *Chriſtians*, all *Chriſtians* are not *Catholicks*; nor have I ever heard of *Catholick Hereticks* in my whole Life.

But what Need of many Words? Let us bring an unqueſtionable Inſtance from *Antiquity.* The *Novatians* and *Donatiſts* were unqueſtionably *Chriſtians*, and by Conſequence within the Pale of what you call *common Chriſtianity.* Yet how were they treated by the Ancient *Fathers?* Did they ever allow them to be *Members* of the *Catholick Church*, or capable of *Salvation?* Nothing leſs. For they wrote whole Volumes to convince them of the Contrary. I ſhall only quote two Paſſages from St *Auſtin* to avoid being tedious.

They (ſays he) *who believe the Incarnation, Paſſion, Reſurrection, and Divinity of Chriſt, yet if they do not communicate with the Whole, whereſoever it is ſpread--- it is evident, they are not in the Catholick Church.* L. de Unit. Eccl. C. 4.

And in the 3d Chap. of the ſame Book he ex-

preſſes himſelf more fully thus. *All thoſe, who believe in Jeſus-Chriſt what Faith Teaches, but differ about his Body the Church; ſo that their Communion it not with the Body, but with ſome ſeparate Part, it is manifeſt they are not in the Catholick Church ---- Both of us have Baptiſm; in that we are united. We have the ſame Goſpel, in this we are alſo united. They celebrate with us the Feaſts of Martyrs, in this we alſo agree ---- But they are not with us in all Things. They are not with us in their Schiſm, they are not with us in their Hereſy. And by Reaſon of thoſe few Things, in which they are not with us, the many Things, in which they are with us, avail them nothing.*

This was St *Auſtin's* Language, and indeed the Language of all the *Ancient Fathers*, when they wrote againſt the *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks* of their Times. They were wholy Strangers to your large Notion of the *Church's Unity* conſiſting in *common Chriſtianity*. A *Body* without a *Head*, and compoſed of *Jarring Heterogenious Parts* appear'd ſo monſtrous to them, that they would never allow any *Heretick* or *Schiſmatick* to be a *Member* of the *Church* of *Chriſt*, or capable of *Salvation*, tho he believed all the *Fundamentals* of *Chriſtianity*. And how then had you juſt now the Aſſurance to inſinuate, *that we have alter'd the common Senſe of Mankind as to the Meaning of the Word Church, or take it in a Senſe different from the whole World?*

§. 12.

The Supremacy *reſumed, with a Touch, upon* Unity.

» *G.* MY Lord, after there was a *Church* at *Rome*, » the *Biſhops* and *Fathers* of thoſe Times » knew nothing of it's *Supremacy*------

« *L.* Stoutly ſaid, Sr.

G. Much

G. Much leſs *Infallibility*. Nor ever appeal'd to « it in their Diſputes with *Heretick*ſ, which had been « the ſhorteſt and ſureſt Way, and impoſſible to « have been forgot, had it been known, and recei- « ved as the current *Faith*, or but opinion of the « *Church*. pag. 16. «

L. Sr, tho the Pope's *Supremacy* always was, his *Infallibility* has never been an Article of the *Church's Faith*; and ſo it is no Wonder, it was not appeal'd to in Diſputes with *Heretick*ſ. But ſuppoſe it had been appeal'd to, how could this have been the ſhorteſt and ſureſt Way to end Diſputes, unleſs you likewiſe ſuppoſe that *Heretick*ſ were always ready to acknowledge it, and ſubmit to it? Whereas they have always diſown'd even the *Church's Infallibility*, which if they would acknowledge, then indeed appealing to *her Authority* would be the ſhorteſt and ſureſt Way to terminate all Diſputes.

G. My Lord, other *Churches* have contended « with that of *Rome*, and aſſerted their own Liber- « ties, and Independency upon her, when her En- « croachments began to ariſe, and diſturb the *Peace* « and *Unity* of the *Church*, which I ſhall ſhew you « preſently. But this only to let you ſee, that the « *Unity* of the *Church* was then underſtood, not as « being united under any one *Supreme Biſhop* or « *Church*; But in the Concord and good Agreement « of the ſeveral *Churches* among themſelves, and in « the *Unity* of the *common Faith*. pag. 16. «

L. I preſume, Sr, you mean the *common Faith*, you ſpoke of before, *viz.* the Belief of *common Chriſtianity*. But pray remember the Inſtance I produced juſt now concerning the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*: and Judge by that, whether there be any Colour of Truth in what you ſay.

You tell me, *other Churches have contended with*

that of Rome, and aſſerted their own Liberties, and Independency upon her. And ſo have alſo many *Rebels* diſputed the *Crown* with their *true* and *lawful Sovereign:* Yet I hope that is no Proof of the *Nullity* of his *Title* to it. But if you mean no more, than that *particular Churches* have ſtood up for their juſt *Rights* and *Liberties* againſt *real* or *ſuppoſed Encroachments* of the *Pope*, this is no more than what *Subjects* do when they go to Law with the *King:* which I preſume they may do Lawfully, and without impeaching, or diſowning his *Regal Authority.* And ſo may *particular Churches* maintain their *Liberties* and *Rights*, provided they keep within the Bounds of *Decency* and *Reſpect;* which are always due to a *Superiour.*

Thus a *Son* may go to Law with his *Father*, if he pretends to wrong him. But he muſt ſtill remember that as he is his *Father*, he ows him a *Subjection* by the Law of *God* and *Nature.* And ſo it is with *particular Churches.* The *Pope* is their *common Father jure Divino*; and all *Biſhops* are his *ſpiritual Children*, and as ſuch ſubject to him. But they are neither his *Vicars*, nor *Slaves.* And therefore, if he ſhould carry his Pretenſions too high, they may oppoſe him without any Breach of *Filial Duty*, or Derogating from his *Jure divino.* And this has generally been the Caſe in Diſputes between *particular Churches* and the *Pope.* So that, what you have alledg'd is far from Anſwering your intended Purpoſe: And you muſt lend me a better Pair of Eyes to make me ſee, *that the Unity of the Church was not then underſtood of her being united under one Supreme Head.* In a Word, Sr, all we mean by the *Pope's Supremacy* is contain'd in the two following Articles.

Firſt, that *Chriſt* after his *Reſurrection*, to preſerve the *Unity* of the *Church*, gave to St *Peter* a *Superintendency* or *Juriſdiction* over his *whole Flock.*

2*dly*, that this Office, according to *Chriſts Inſtitution*, was after St *Peter's* Deceaſe to paſs to his *Succeſſors* appointed by the *Church*; and theſe have always been *Biſhops* of *Rome*, tho they might have been *Biſhops* of any other *Dioceſs*, if St *Peter* had fix'd the *Papal Seat* in any other Place.

St *Auſtin* join'd both theſe together, when he ſaid. *A Succeſſion of Biſhops from the See of St Peter, to whom Chriſt after his Reſurrection committed his Flock to the preſent Epiſcopacy holds me in the Catholick Church.* L. contra Epiſt. Fund. C. 4.

And St *Jerom* writing to Pope *Damaſus. I am join'd* (ſays he) *in Communion with your Holineſs, that is, with the Chair of St Peter. Upon that Rock I know the Church is built. Whoever eats the Lamb out of this Houſe is prophane. If any one be not in the Ark, he will periſh in the Deluge:----I know not* Vitalis, *I refuſe* Meletius, *I am a Stanger to* Paulinus. *Whoever gathers not with thee, Scatters* [quicunque tecum non colligit, ſpargit] *that is, he who is not Chriſt's, is Antichriſts.* Epiſt. 57.

What two rank *Papiſts* were St *Auſtin*, and St *Jerom*! One would think *Bellarmin* had dictated to them. In Effect, Sr, if *Antiquity*, and the Senſe of the moſt eminent *Pillars* of the *Church* be of any Weight, theſe two Paſſages alone are a full Confutation of every Thing you have hitherto ſaid againſt the *Pope's* Supremacy, and particularly of that bold and groundleſs Aſſertion, viz. *that the Ancient Biſhops and Fathers knew nothing of the Supremacy of the See of Rome.* Truly, Sr, when a Man talks at this wild Rate, he ſeems reſolved to outface the ſtrongeſt Evidence. But we ſhall have more of this hereafter.

G. St *Paul* Epheſ. 4. ℣. 3. 4. 5. deſcribes the « *Unity* of the *Church* by having all *one Lord*, *one* «

» *Faith, one Baptiſm*, and *one Spirit*, from which they » are call'd *one Body*. The *Unity* of the *Spirit* is their » *Unity* with *God*, and the *Bond* of *Peace* is the *U-* » *nity* of the *Churches* with each other as *Members* » of the ſame *Body*. And this is a much ſtricter and » cloſer *Union* than that of the *ſecular World*. pag. » 16. 17.

L. Sr, St *Paul's* Words, when quoted full at Length, are their own beſt Interpreters. They are as follows. *I therefore the Priſoner of the Lord beſeech you, that you walk worthy of the Vocation, wherewith ye are call'd. With all Lowlineſs and Meekneſs, with long Suffering; forbearing one another in Love; endeavouring to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace. There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as you are call'd to one Hope of your Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm.* Epheſ. 4. ℣. 1. 2. &c. Theſe are St *Paul's* Words; and it is manifeſt from them, that it was his main Drift to exhort the *Epheſians* to mutual Love and Charity, which he calls the *Unity of Spirit*, and *Bond* of *Peace*. But do's the *Unity of the Spirit*, and the *Bond of the Peace* exclude our being united under *one Head?* On the contrary do's not that render the Union of the Faithfull ſtill more perfect, and cement them more cloſely together? You cannot therefore draw any Conſequence from St *Paul's* Words either againſt the *Pope's Supremacy*, or in Favour of your large Syſtem of the *Church's Unity of Faith* conſiſting in the bare belief of *common Chriſtianity*. Nay his Words plainly inſinuate the contrary. For *firſt* he tells the *Epheſians* that the Church of Chriſt is but *one Body* Which shews that she is in *one Communion*; and *2dly*, he tells them, that the *Church of Chriſt* has but *One Faith*. And how will this agree to a *Church* of your *large Size*, which takes in all Societies of *Chriſtians* whatſoever? For there

are *Lutheran Chriſtians*, and *Calvinian Chriſtians*, and *Puritan Chriſtians*, and *Anabaptiſt Chriſtians*, and *Church of England Chriſtians*, and *Popiſh Chriſtians* too I hope. And pray, Sr, have theſe all *one Faith*? 'Tis very ſtrange if they have, ſince they have been *Diſputing* and *Fighting* about *Religion* for near two hundred Years. 'Tis plain then that St *Paul's* Idea of the *Church's Unity* is not of the ſame *large Size* with yours: and you have been very unlucky to put me in Mind of his Words.

§. 13.

Of new Articles of Faith, and the Sacraments.

C. MY Lord, all Churches agree in that Summary of Faith call'd the *Apoſtles Creed:* « and the *Church of Rome* herſelf muſt think this ſufficient for Salvation, becauſe she requires no other « Profeſſion of Faith in *Baptiſm*, or for being admitted into the Church. But the 12 new Articles « of Faith, which the Council of *Trent* has added « to the 12 of the Apoſtles, which are call'd *Pope* « *Pius's Creed*, and is required to be profeſs'd by « *Converts*, has made many Conteſts and Diviſions « in the Church. And I have not yet met with any « *Roman Catholick* ſo hardy as to ſay, that the Belief « of all thoſe is neceſſary to Salvation, only that we « should not deny or oppoſe them, ſuch as *Purgatory*, the *Invocation of Saints*, *&c.* pag. 17. «

L. Sr, you tell me firſt, *that all Churches agree in that Summary of Faith call'd the Apoſtles Creed.* But I muſt beg your Pardon. For none of your Churches agree with us in that *Creed.* Becauſe Agreeing with us is Agreeing in the Senſe of every Article of that *Creed* as well as in the Words it contains. Now you

diſagree with us in the Senſe of the Article concerning the *Catholick Church*, which we with all former Ages place in *one Communion*, but you in *Many*. Becauſe the ſmall Extent of your Church being too narrow to make it paſs for *Univerſal* forces you to link it with many other *heretical* Churches, and by this rare Invention to enlarge the Bounds of it.

But you ſeem diſſatisfied with our Church for Judging the *Apoſtles Creed* ſufficient for *Infants*, and yet requiring more of *Converts*. Sr, she requires no more *Faith* of the one, than of the other. But only a more ample Declaration of it. For she demands an entire Faith of Infants, and but an entire Faith of Converts, tho under a longer or shorter Form of Words as she ſees Occaſion. And the Reaſon why she demands it of Converts in a longer Form of Words than of Infants, is, becauſe there can be no doubt of the Sincerity of Infants: but that of new Converts cannot be ſo ſecurely depended upon: whom therefore she obliges to profeſs *explicitly* the Same Truths of Faith, which Infants profeſs *implicitly* by Profeſſing to believe the *Catholick Church*.

You tell me likewiſe *the Trent-Articles or Pope Pius's Creed has made many Conteſts or Diviſions in the Church*. But you may ſay the ſame of the Articles, or *Creed* of the great *Council* of *Nice*. Which defined the *Conſubſtantiality* of the *Son* againſt the Arians. For as that Council only explain'd the ancient Faith of the Church, ſo the Council of *Trent* and Pope *Pius's Creed* have done no more. And therefore as the long *Conteſts* and *Diviſions* occaſion'd by the *Nicene Creed* was wholly Owing to the Pride and Obſtinacy of the *Arians*, who refuſed to ſubmit to the Deciſion of that Council; ſo your *firſt Reformers*, who had the Pride to ſet up their *private Judgment* againſt

the Doctrine of the *Univerſal Church*, and continued obſtinate in it, are alone accountable for the Conteſts and Diviſions you ſpeak of.

Laſtly you tell me, *you never met with any Catholick ſo hardy as to ſay, that the Belief of all Pope Pius's Articles is neceſſary to Salvation, only that we ſhould not deny or oppoſe them.* Then, Sr, I muſt tell you plainly, it never yet was your good Fortune to meet a *Roman Catholick*, that underſtood his Religion. But I preſume you Judge of our Church by your own, which propoſes her 39 Articles without any Obligation to believe them, according to Bishop *Bramhal* in his *Schiſm guarded*, p. 190. where he writes thus. *We do not look upon the Articles of the Church of England as Eſſentials of ſaving Faith, or Legacies of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: but in a Mean, as pious Opinions fitted for the Preſervation of Unity. Neither do we oblige any Man to believe them, but only not to contradict them.* But our Church is not ſo complaiſant, as to ſet forth Profeſſions of Faith, which no Body is bound to believe: or to be content with ſuch a *Unity*, as allows *Diverſity* of *Faiths* at Pleaſure, and makes Men turn Hypocrits in profeſſing one Thing, and believing another. Therefore every *Roman Catholick*, who underſtands the Principles of his Religion, will inform you, that tho indeed the knowledge of all reveal'd Truths be no more neceſſary to Salvation, than the knowledge of the *whole Bible*, yet every reveal'd Truth, when *duly propoſed*, is to be believed. And it is not ſufficient not to deny or oppoſe any ſuch Truth, but a poſitive inward Aſſent is to be given to it.

G. It ſeems then the Church has a Charter to impoſe as many *new Creeds* as she pleaſes.

L. Sr, if by *new Creeds* you mean nothing elſe but *new Explanations* of the *Ancient Faith* for her De-

fence againſt new Hereſies, the Church has certainly full Power to ſet forth ſuch *Creeds*, and oblige her Children to a Belief of the Articles they contain. This Power was exerciſed by the two firſt general Councils: that of *Nice*, and that of *Conſtantinople*, both received by the *Church of England*. The Council of *Nice* added to the *Apoſtles Creed* the following Article. *I believe in one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the only begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all Worlds; God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God; begotten not made, conſubſtantial to the Father.* And whoever refuſed to aſſent to this additional Article, was not acknowledg'd for a Member of the *Catholick Church*.

The Council of *Conſtantinople* made likewiſe an Addition to the *Nicene Creed* in this Article againſt the *Macedonians*. viz. *and in the Holy Ghoſt the Lord and Giver of Life; who proceeds from the Father and the Son, together is adored and glorified, who ſpoke by the Prophets.* It alſo added this Article *begotten of the Father before all Worlds*, againſt *Photinus*: and this other, *Whoſe Kingdom ſhall have no End*, againſt the *Millenarians*. All which are actually a Part of the *Nicene Creed*.

After this appear'd the *Athanaſian Creed* containing many Articles concerning the *Trinity*, the *Perſons*, and the *Proceſſions* of them: whereof there is no expreſs Mention either in the *Apoſtles Creed*, or that of *Nice*. And it was received by the whole *Catholick Church*: and what is very remarkable, it begins and ends with this Article: *except every one keep that Faith whole and undefiled, without Doubt he ſhall perish eternally.*

The Church therefore has always had Power to make an Addition of ſuch Articles, as she Judg'd would be a neceſſary Antidote to hinder the Poiſon

of

of new Hereſies againſt the Ancient Faith from ſpreading. And you yourſelf, Sr, cannot deny this without Renouncing the 8th *Article of Religion*, which is thus. *The three Creeds, Nice Creed, Athanaſius's Creed, and that, which is commonly call'd the Apoſtles Creed ought throughly to be received and believ'd, for they may be proved by moſt certain Warrant of Holy Scripture.* Here, Sr, your own Church requires a Belief of two *new Creeds* over and above that of the *Apoſtles*, and acknowledges a full Power in the Church to make ſuch *Creeds* according to the Exigencies of Times, and oblige the faithful not only to an explicite Profeſſion, but inward Belief of the Articles they contain.

G. Can the Church then coin *new Articles* of Faith?

L. No, Sr, but she may add *new Articles* to explain the *ancient Creed*, or Faith.

G. Pray, My Lord, what Article in the *Apoſtles Creed* do's *Tranſubſtantiation* explain? For there is nothing of all the *Sacraments* in that *Creed*, pag. 17.

L. Very right, Sr; There is nothing of the *Sacraments* in that *Creed*. But do's not this confute your falſe Notion of that Creed's Expreſſing all neceſſary Truths of Faith? For are the *Sacraments*, as likewiſe the *canonical Books* of Scripture, and the *Precepts* of a Chriſtian Life no Objects of your Faith, becauſe they are not expreſs'd in the *Creed?* I doubt not but they are. 'Tis therefore evident againſt you, that the *Apoſtles Creed* neither expreſſes, nor was intended to expreſs all neceſſary Truths of Faith, but only the principal ones: As for the reſt, they are all contain'd in general under the Article of the *Catholic Church*; in as much as Believing the Church implies believing her whole Doctrine.

» *G.* My Lord, the *Sacraments* are the *Signs* or » *Seals* of our Faith, as *Circumciſion* was call'd *Rom.* » 4. ℣. 11. but not the Faith itſelf; and therefore » are not put into the Summary of our Faith. » *pag.* 17.

L. Sr, you have made a wonderful Diſcovery in telling me, *that the Sacraments are not the Faith itſelf.* But tho they be not the *Faith itſelf* (which is a *Theological Virtue*, and the Act of it an inward Aſſent of the Mind) are they not the Objects of Chriſtian Faith as well as the *Signs* or *Seals* of it? Is there nothing reveal'd concerning *Baptiſm* or the *Lord's Supper*, which we are bound to believe? This would be pleaſing Doctrine to *Quakers*: but I preſume no Chriſtian Divine will relish it.

» *G.* They are generally neceſſary, as our *Cate-* » *chiſm* Words it: that is, to be reverently uſed, » when they may be had: but they are not abſolu- » tely neceſſary. So that if our Circumſtances or » Places where we live be ſuch, as not to afford us » the Opportunity of Receiving the Sacraments we » should be damn'd for Want of them. I think » none will ſay this. They are Mean's of God's Ap- » pointment; therefore to be uſed when we can have » them. We are tied to this. But God, is not tied » to thoſe Means, to which he ties us. He can ſave » us without them. Even of thoſe five, which you » have more than we, you cannot ſay they are ſo » much as generally neceſſary to Salvation: becauſe » none can partake of them all. For your *Sacrament* » of *Orders* excludes all the Laity, and that of *Mar-* » *riage* the Clergy. *pag.* 18.

L. I perceive, Sr, you are diſpoſed to be upon the Ramble. For ſuppoſing all you have ſaid to be ſtrictly true (whereas it is liable to ſeveral Exceptions) what Connection has it with the Matter un-

der debate? Our Diſpute was, whether the *Sacraments* be not properly the *Objects* of *Faith*, tho they be not mention'd in the *Creed?* But inſtead of keeping to the Point in Queſtion, you have made an Harangue to prove that the *Uſe* of them is not *abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.* Suppoſe it be not, what then? Is there therefore nothing to be believed of them? The Truth of the Matter is, you know not well what you are bound to believe, what not. For where there are no Principles, or thoſe very Principles are a *Seed* of *Diviſion*, there can be no Steddineſs or Uniformity in Faith. And this is the Reaſon, why there are ſo many *Sects* and *Diviſions* amongſt you, all ſpawn'd from the *Reformation.*

§. 14.

Of Sects, *and* Diviſions.

C. MY Lord, not ſo many with us as with « you. *pag.* 18. «

L. Stoutly ſaid, Sr; and I promiſe to be of your Opinion, when you can make out theſe three Things. 1. That *Scripture* interpreted by *private Judgment* is our *Rule of Faith.* 2. That we agree with you in your *Latitudinarian* Notion of the *Church's Unity* conſiſting in the bare Belief of *common Chriſtianity*; and 3*dly*, that we call *Preſbyterians*, *Puritans*, *Independents*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Quakers*, *&c.* or any *ſeparate Communion* our *Catholick Brethren*; as you call moſt of them your *Proteſtant Brethren.* Nay the very fundamental Principle of the *Reformation* as *ſuch*, obliges you to call even thoſe your *Brethren*, who are immediately gone out from you, and broke off from your Communion. Becauſe they have all broke off from you upon the very ſame Principles, on which you groun-

ded your Separation from the *Church of Rome*. For, as you accuſed her of *Superſtition*, ſo they repay you in your own Coin. And as you appeal'd from your *Mother-Church* to *Scriptures* interpreted by your own darling *private Judgment*, ſo they attack you with the very ſame Weapon. And therefore you are anſwerable for all the *Sects*, that ever have divided, or ever will divide themſelves from you.

» *G.* If a Church be anſwerable for all that break » off from her, then you have all the *Sects*, you » have named, to reckon for, and us too, which » is one more. And if you are not anſwerable for » thoſe, that broke off from you, neither are we » anſwerable for thoſe, that broke off from us. » *pag.* 19.

L. No, Sr! I ſhall convince you of your Miſtake. If either the *Church of England*, or any other *Sect* had broke off from us upon a *Principle acknowledg'd by us*, then we ſhould be reſponſable for their *Separation*. But ſince we diſown and deteſt any ſuch Principle, the Guilt of their *Schiſm* lies at their own Doors, and cannot be charged upon the *Church of Rome*. But the Caſe is not ſo with you. For you maintain a *Principle*, which cannot but produce *Sects* and *Diviſions*. You make the *Scriptures* interpreted by *private Judgment* the *Rule* of your *Faith*: And *private Judgment* is the fruitful Mother of *Hereſies* and *Schiſms*. And 'tis the true Reaſon, why no *Hereſy* ever came into the World without a Litter of *Sects* in the Belly of it. A rotten Dunghil is not ſo fruitful in Breeding Vermin, as *private Judgment* interpreting *Scriptures* by its own Light is in Producing *Sects*. Yet by this Rule you guided yourſelves in your Separation from the *Church of Rome*.

You have therefore ſet the Pattern to *Preſbyterians*, *Puritans*, *Independents*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Quakers*,

Free-thinkers, and other *Sects*, that have ſwarm'd from you. They do but follow your Example: They are your faithful Diſciples, and true *Proteſtant* Brethren in that very *Principle*, which divided them from you. So that you cannot blame their *Separation* from the *Church of England* without condemning your own *Separation* from the *Church of Rome*, and you are fully anſwerable both for their *Schiſm*, and your own: Becauſe it is the Fruit of a Tree of your own Planting, and the natural Conſequence of a *Principle*, you conſtantly Maintain. But we have no ſuch Principle, or *Seed* of *Diviſion* in our Church, which makes us perfectly *One* among ourſelves in all *Articles* of *Faith*.

G. So is every *Church* or *Sect*. That is, thoſe « who agree among themſelves, do agree. So that « this is no more a Mark of *Unity*, than every *Di-* « *viſion* of Men can plead, and every *Sect*. pag. 19. «

L. Sr, nothing is more certain, than *that they, who agree among themſelves, do agree*. But you will have ſome Difficulty to convince me, that there can be the ſame Harmony and Agreement in any *Sect*, or *Body* of *Men*, the very Foundation of whoſe Religion is a *Principle*, or *Seed* of *Diviſion*, as there is in a Church, which abhors *that Principle*. Can there be the ſame Agreement among thoſe, who are guided by their own *private Judgment*, as among thoſe, who are bound to ſubmit to the Authority of a *Supreme Tribunal*, from which there is no *Appeal*?

Your Miſtake then lies here, *viz.* in Imagining, that all the Members of any *Sect* of this or that *Denomination* agree in the ſame *Syſtem* of Religion, which is morally impoſſible. Becauſe whoever makes *private Judgment* the *Guide* of his *Faith*, may change it with every Change of the Moon. Nay what ſeems *Reaſon* to day, may ſeem otherwiſe to Morrow: And

ſo he will be incoherent not only with other Members of the *ſame Sect*, but even with himſelf. Nay upon the ſame Principle 'tis not impoſſible, but a *Sect* of the ſame *external Denomination* may be divided into as *many Religions*, as it has *Families* belonging to it, becauſe their *private Judgments* may all differ, and they have no *Principle* of *Unity* to cement them: Whereas the *Rule of Faith* among *Roman Catholicks* (which is the *Word of God*, as *interpreted* by the *Church*, whoſe *Decrees* all are bound to ſubmit to) unites them all in the ſame Belief; notwithſtanding their prodigious *Numbers*, the Diverſity of their *Intereſts*, *Cuſtoms*, and *Languages*; and tho they be the *great Body* of *Chriſtians*, from which all went forth.

» *G.* No, My Lord, not *Half*, nor ever were. The » *Greek Church* is an *elder* Church than yours: So » that you rather broke off from her by Setting up » your *univerſal Supremacy*; which ſhe never own'd; » nor the many other numerous Churches of *Aſia*, » nor the Great, and once famous Churches of *Africa*, nor the *Empire* of *Ruſſia* of vaſt Extent in *Europe*, once a Part of the *Greek Church*. Theſe never own'd the *Supremacy* of *Rome*, and by far outnumber all, that ever did own it, or were of her Communion as ſuch. And conſidering how many *Nations* and *Kingdoms* have broke off from her ſince the *Reformation*, her Communion is now reduced to a ſmall Part of the Chriſtian Church in Compariſon of thoſe that differ from her. *pag.* 19, 20.

L. Sr, there are but three material and notorious Falſehoods in what you have now ſaid: as I ſhall endeavour to convince you. 1. That the *Church of Rome* rather broke off from the *Greek Church*, than the *Greek Church* from the *Church of Rome*. 2. That neither the *Greek Church*, nor the other Churches

mention'd by you ever aknowledg'd the *Supremacy* of the Bishop of *Rome*. And 3. that the Church in Communion with the *See of Rome* never was one Half of the *great Body of Chriſtians*, whence all went forth. As to what you add concerning our preſent Numbers, which is a fourth Falſehood of leſs Conſequence, I shall have Occaſion to ſpeak of it hereafter.

But before I undertake to shew the Falſehood of the three Facts, you have aſſerted, I fairly chalenge you to mark me out any one *ſeparate Society* of *Chriſtians* upon Earth, but what either went out immediately from us, or ſpawn'd from thoſe that did, or, what is equivalent, received their Religion from them; as the *Muſcovits* did from the *Greeks*: who, as I shall now prove, went out immediately from us. For, if you cannot shew me any ſuch Society of Chriſtians, then 'tis an unconteſtable Truth what I have ſaid, *viz. That the Church in Communion with the See of Rome is the great and ſtanding Body of Chriſtians, whence all went forth.* I shall begin with Examining your firſt Aſſertion, and put it to the Teſt of a plain Narrative of the Fact, whereof I am ſure you cannot diſprove the leaſt Tittle.

§. 15.

The Greek Church *broke off from the* Church of Rome.

IN the Year 841 *Michael* the 3d being very Young ſucceeded his Father *Theophilus* in the *Oriental Empire*, under the Guardianship of his Mother *Theodora*. But *Bardas* the Emperor's Uncle had a Share in the Government. This Man was deſperately in Love with his Daughter in Law, with whom he held a ſecret Commerce. St *Ignatius* then *Patriarch* of

Conſtantinople check'd him for it, and finding his Admonitions ineffectual refuſed to give him the *Sacrament* on the Feaſt of the *Epiphany*.

Bardas, who was of a furious and cruel Temper, incenſed at this perſuades the Young Emperor to ſend away his Mother and Siſter into a Monaſtery, and commit the Execution of it to the *Patriarch*; who refuſing to obey ſo unjuſt a Command was loaded with Calumnies, and banish'd to the Iſle of *Terebinthus*.

Photius principal Secretary of State, and Captain of the Guards, was put into his Place. He was made a *Monk* the firſt Day, *Reader* the next, and the following Days *Subdeacon*, *Deacon*, and *Prieſt*. So that in ſix Days Time (the true *Patriarch* being yet alive) he invaded the *Patriarchal* Throne on *Chriſtmaſs-day* An. 858. The Bishop, by whom he was ordain'd was excommunicated upon it by St *Ignatius*, who alſo accuſed him to the *Pope*. Whereupon *the Pope required of Ignatius, that he ſhould ſend ſome Perſon to Rome to give him a full Information of that Affair. Which he did accordingly, ſending one* Lazarus. *And the Point being duly examined by Pope* Benedict, *the next Succeſſor to* Leo, Ignatius *his Sentence was approved by the holy See.* [Du Pin. Cent. 9. pag. 86.]

Nicholas I. ſucceeded *Benedict*: to whom *Photius*, that his Election might be confirm'd at *Rome*, ſent an Embaſſy with a falſe Account of St *Ignatius*. viz. that by Reaſon of his Age he had voluntarily quitted the *Patriarchal See*, had retired into a Monaſtery of a certain Iſland, and was in great Eſteem both of the Prince and People. Soon after he procured his Condemnation in a *pack'd Council* of *Oriental* Biſhops; when the injured *Patriarch* drew up a Petition by way of Appeal to the *Pope*; Begging his Aſſiſtance in

in Imitation of his Predeceſſors *Fabian*, *Julius*, *Innocent*, *Leo*. The Pope undertook the Defence of perſecuted Innocence: And *Photius*, becauſe he could not prevail upon him to be an Abetter of his Crime, forſook his Communion.

This is the Fact as far as is to our Purpoſe fairly related: and let any impartial Man Judge from it, whether the *Pope* broke off from *Photius* rather than *Photius* from the *Pope*. We have here a wicked Courtier ſupported by the Authority of a Prince as bad as himſelf, invading the *Patriarchal Throne* by the violent Depoſition of the *legal Poſſeſſor*. He applies himſelf to the *Pope* to approve his *Intruſion*; but finding his Virtue proof againſt Flattery and Threats, he diſowns that very *Authority*, to which at firſt he thought it neceſſary to have Recourſe; withdraws himſelf from the Pope's *Communion*, and by Degrees engages a great Part of the *Greek Church* in his Quarrel. If this Man, and his Adherents were not guilty of *Schiſm*, there never was ſuch a Thing in the World. But 'tis an eaſy Matter to gueſs, what makes you ſo zealous for the *Greeks*. *Henry* the 8th, and Bishop *Cranmer* only copied after the Pattern ſet them by the wicked *Emperor* and *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, and they cannot poſſibly be acquitted of the Guilt of *Schiſm*, unleſs *Photius* be firſt clear'd, or at leaſt a Fact call'd in Queſtion, which never admitted of any Diſpute.

G. But is not the *Greek Church* Elder than the *Church of Rome*? And if it be ſo, do's it not follow that the *Church of Rome* rather broke off from her?

L. A ſtout Argument indeed! But it will do no Execution unleſs you make it appear, that *Age* and *Juriſdiction* always go together. Sr, there are ſeveral *Biſhopricks* in *Great Britain* more ancient than *Canterbury*; yet the Bishop of that See is their *Primate*,

The ſame is atteſted by the *Pope's* own Letter related by St *Athanaſius*. For (ſays the Pope) *Athanaſius did not come of his own Accord, but as cited, and having received our Letters.* In Apol. Adv. Ari. §. 29. p. 148.

Relating to the ſame Matter the *Greek* Hiſtorians *Socrates* and *Sozomen* tell us, that both St *Athanaſius*, and other *Oriental* Bishops being accuſed by the' *Euſebians*, and violently deprived of their reſpective *Sees*, were reſtored by the *Authority* of the Bishop of *Rome*.

Sozomen ſpeaking of *Marcellus*, *Aſclepas*, St *Lucius* Bishop of *Adrianople*, and St *Paul* Bishop of *Conſtantinople* ſays, *the Bishop of Rome having taken Cogniſance of their Cauſe, received them into his Communion. And becauſe,* BY REASON OF THE DIGNITY OF HIS SEE, THE CARE OF ALL BELONG'D TO HIM, *he reſtored them to their reſpective Bishopriks.* Soz. L. 3. C. 8. p. 507.

And *Socrates* writes thus. *When* Athanaſius, Paulus, Aſclepas, Marcellus *and* Lucius *had open'd their Cauſe to* Julius, *he* ACCORDING TO THE PREROGATIVE OF THE ROMAN SEE, *ſent them back into the Eaſt with the Protection of his Letters, and reſtored to each of them his See.* L. 2. C. 15. p. 91.

Here we ſee the *Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Authority* exerciſed by the Bishop of *Rome:* acknowledg'd by the *Arians* themſelves, ſubmitted to by the *two firſt Patriarchs*, and other Bishops of the *Eaſt*, and finally atteſted by three *Greek* Hiſtorians. And can you then ſay, the *Supremacy* was never own'd by the *Greek Church?*

I prove it *ſecondly* from three of the four firſt *General Councils*. In that of *Conſtantinople* none but *Oriental* Bishops were preſent: Yet the *Fathers* of that *Council* in their *Synodical* Letter to Pope *Damaſus*

thank him for *Calling* them to a Council *as his Members:* And *Damaſus* in his Anſwer ſtiles them his moſt honourable *Children.* Apud Theod. L. 5. Hiſt. C. 9. 10.

In the General Council of *Epheſus* Pope *Celeſtine's* Legate told the Council *that his Maſter was their Head, and the Succeſſor of St Peter, whoſe place and Authority the Bishop of Rome held.* Againſt which not one in the Council made the leaſt Objection. Act. 2. T. 3. Conc. p. 619. Act. 3. p. 626.

Laſtly, the *General Council* of *Calcedon* in it's *Synodical* Letter to Pope *Leo*, after having told him, that they were an Aſſembly of 520 Bishops over whom he had *preſided* as HEAD, they complain of the Inſolence of *Dioſcorus Patriarch* of *Alexandria* in theſe Terms. *Moreover he let looſe his Madneſs even againſt him, who was by our Saviour entruſted with the Care of the Vineyard; that is, againſt your Apoſtolical Highneſs.* And they conclude with deſiring the Pope to honour their Judgment with his Decree. *Conc. Calced. in Epiſt. ad Leonem.* Tom. 4. If this be not Owning the Pope's Supremacy, no King was ever own'd by his Subjects. And 'tis to be obſerved, that theſe are three of the four General Councils approved and received by the *Church of England.*

Add to all this the above-mention'd Teſtimony of St *Gregory* declaring it to be a Thing, which no Body doubted of, *viz.* that *Conſtantinople* was ſubject to the *Apoſtolick See.* L. 9. Epiſt. 59. p. 976. And both St *Cyprian* and St *Auſtin* two *African* Bishops, whom I have already quoted for the Supremacy both of St *Peter* and his Succeſſors, are authentick Witneſſes, that the *African Churches* acknowledg'd both the one and the other.

tion to it, is not only falſe, but *ungodly* and *pernicious* Doctrine.

ADVERTISEMENT.

It appears plainly from this and the 2 former Sections, *how much there was to be ſaid to the* Gentleman's *laſt Words C S. pag. 19. 20. yet the good peaceable Lord only anſwer'd this one Line to it. L.* But thoſe other Churches do not communicate with each other. *p. 20. to which the* Gentleman *replies thus.*

» *G.* NOr *Rome* with any of them. So that she
» ſtands by herſelf, as other Churches do.
» And the moſt irreconcilably of any. Becauſe by
» her Principles she cannot communicate with any,
» who will not own her *Supremacy*. Which as it
» never was done by the greateſt Part of the *Catho-*
» *lick Church*, ſo there is little Appearance that it
» ever will be: for it is obſervable that no Nation,
» that broke off from *Rome*, did ever return to her
» again. It is a hard Matter for one that has eſca-
» ped out of a Snare, to be inveigled thither again.
» So that it is very viſible *Rome* has been upon the
» loſing Hand about theſe 200 Years paſt. And that
» not only as to thoſe, who have quite forſaken
» her, but as to the Change of *Principles*, and *Low-*
» *ring* her *Supremacy*, and *Infallibility* amongſt thoſe
» who ſtill remain in her Communion; which I shall
» shew your *Lordship* preſently; and that *Old* and
» *New Popery* are very different Things, and that
» *Rome* itſelf has in ſome Meaſure been reform'd by
» our *Reformation*. pag. 20.

C. Sr, I shall give a very brief Anſwer to the good-natured Things you have ſaid. *Firſt*, you tell me, *that the Church of Rome ſtands by herſelf as other Churches*

Churches do. She do's ſo: and 'tis much better to be alone, than in bad Company. Nay the *true Church* muſt ſtand by herſelf, whether she will or no: becauſe she would not be the *true Church*, if *Heretick*s were in her Communion. Thus *Heaven* will ſtand by itſelf for all Eternity, excluding every Thing that is defiled. But I hope this is no Exception againſt it.

2ly, you ſay, *that by her Principles she cannot communicate with any, who will not own her Supremacy.* Very true, Sr. But you add immediately, *that this was never done by the greateſt Part of the Catholick Church*; which is falſe. For *Heretick*s and *Schiſmatick*s (whom you mean by your *greateſt Part of the Catholick Church*) are no Part of her, as I have fully proved, and shall prove farther hereafter 1. p. §. 54. However I shall now ask a few Queſtions to lead you to a clear Sight of your Miſtake. Pray, Sr, is not *Schiſm* a *Breach* of *Communion?*

G. Who doubts it?

L. And can *Communion* be broke, where there never was any?

G. No, My Lord. For as a Breach of Peace ſuppoſes that there was a Peace, ſo a *Breach* of *Communion* muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe that there was a *Communion.*

L. Very good, Sr. And did not then the *Greek Church*, and all other Churches now *Reform'd* communicate with the *See of Rome*, before they forſook her Communion?

G. I cannot deny it. But what do you inferr from thence?

L. Sr, I inferr *firſt*, that therefore *all theſe Churches* once own'd the *Supremacy* of the *See of Rome:* Becauſe according to your own Saying, *the Church of Rome cannot communicate with any, who will not own her Supremacy.* And I inferr *2dly*, that you contra-

dict yourſelf in the very ſame Breath by Adding immediately, *that the greateſt Part of the Catholick Church* (as you call it) *never own'd her Supremacy.*

You tell me next, *that no Nation, which broke off from Rome, did ever return to her again.* Whence you conclude, *that she has been upon the Loſing Hand about theſe* 200 *Years paſt.* To which I anſwer, that if she has been a *Loſer* in *Europe*, she has been a *Gainer* in other Parts of the World. As in *China*, the *Philippine* Iſlands, in *Goa*; and the large Kingdoms of *Mexico*, *Peru*, and *Brazil* in *America.* However you are pleaſed to give a very obliging Reaſon, why *no Nation, which broke off from Rome, ever return'd to her again*; viz. *Becauſe it is a hard Matter for one, that has eſcaped out of a Snare, to be inveigled thither again.* But I can furniſh you with two much better Reaſons for it. *Firſt*, becauſe *Obſtinacy* is the darling Quality of all true *Hereticks*; and *the Perverſe* or *Obſtinate are hard to be corrected.* Eccleſ. 1. ℣. 15. *2dly*, Becauſe the *Reform'd Churches* have their peculiar Charms to keep Men faſt, which the *Church of Rome* do's not pretend to. For *Liberty* and *Eaſe* are much prettier Things than *Faſting*, or *Confeſſing* one's Sins, and Doing *Penance* for them. So that it is no Wonder, that they, who have once taſted the Sweetneſs of true *Proteſtant Liberty*, should not be fond of Returning to *Popiſh Reſtraints.*

But the next Thing you tell me is a Piece of News, I never heard of before: viz. *that the Church of Rome has changed her Principles, and lower'd her Supremacy and Infallibility among thoſe, who ſtill remain in her Communion.* Now indeed the poor *Church of Rome* is undone to all Intents and Purpoſes, if you can make Good this Charge againſt her. But you think fit to remain in my Debt for the Proof of it: and I believe it will prove one of thoſe deſperate Debts,

which are all to be paid at the *Greek Calends.*

Laſtly, you tell me, *that Rome itſelf has in ſome Meaſure been reform'd by the Reformation.* Truly, Sr, I am of too generous a Nature to diſown any Obligation. And therefore ſince it is certain, that the Oppoſition of *Heretick*s has always been a Spur to Learning, and the frequent Temptations of the *Devil* make *Chriſtians* more watchful; I cannot without being guilty of Ingratitude diſown, that the *Reformation* has *reform'd* the *Church of Rome* juſt as the *Devil* reforms *Chriſtians* by Obliging them to be upon their Guard. Now, Sr, go on.

G. I know nothing ſhould hinder me from « Communicating with the *Greek Church*, if I were « there, while nothing *ſinful* were required of me as « a Condition of Communion, nor new *Creds* to be « impoſed on me: And ſo of the Churches of St *Tho-* « *mas*, the *Jacobits*, and others in the *Eaſt* of *Aſia*, « of whom we have very imperfect and uncertain « Accounts: And ſo of the *Abiſſines*, the *Cophtes*, and « other Churches in *Africa*, and the great Church « of *Ruſſia* in *Europe*. But *Rome*, while ſhe pretends « to *univerſal Supremacy* can communicate with none « but herſelf. So that our Communion is more *ex-* « *tended*, or *extendable* than that of *Rome*. And this « *univerſal Supremacy* is that, which moſt of any one « Thing in the World hinders the Union, or Com- « munion of *Chriſtian* Churches. *pag.* 20. 21. «

L. Sr, we covet not the Union or Communion of *Heretical Chriſtian Churches* upon any other Condition than that of an entire Submiſſion to the Authority, which Chriſt has eſtabliſh'd. And ſo 'tis very true what you ſay, viz. *that the Church of Rome cannot communicate with any but herſelf:* As *Light* cannot communicate with *Darkneſs*, nor *Chriſt* with *Belial*. And therefore if by taking in the whole Rif-

raff of *Hereticks* you render your Church more extendable than ours, much Good may it do you.

Now as to what you tell me, *that nothing should hinder you from Communicating with the Greek Church, or the other Churches mention'd by you, while nothing ſinful were required of you as a Condition of Communion, nor new Creeds impoſed upon you.* I hope, Sr, the *Church of Rome* may have a Share in your good Graces upon the ſame Terms. But what Trifling Stuff is this! For you may as well tell me, that nothing should hinder you from Communicating with the *Turkiſh Muſty*, or the *Jewiſh Rabbies*, or the *Indian Brachmans*, if *nothing ſinful were required of you as a Condition of Communion.* But I muſt acquaint you, Sr, that if you will communicate with the *Greek* or *Ruſſian Church*, of which you are ſo fond, you muſt firſt abjure your 5th *Article* of *Religion* concerning the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, and 2dly, you muſt ſubſcribe to every Article of Pope *Pius's Profeſſion of Faith*, the *Supremacy* alone excepted. For in every Thing elſe the *Greeks* and *Muſcovits* agree with us.

§. 18.

Mr Du Pin *explain'd.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

After the Gentleman's *laſt Words in his* Caſe ſtated, *his* Lordship *is made to anſwer thus.* But tho one Church be Supreme, yet the beſt Part of Roman Catholicks place not the Infallibility there, but in a General, or Oecumenical Council, where all Churches meet. *Now by theſe laſt Words,* Where ALL CHURCHES meet, *is meant (according to the*

Gentleman's *Intention*) *not only the Repreſentatives of the whole* Catholick Church, *but of all* Separate Communions, *that is, of all* Heretical *and* Schiſmatical Churches; *conformably to the* large Syſtem *of the* Church's Unity *eſtabliſh'd by him. And, according to this wild Notion, he anſwers as follows.*

G. MY Lord, there never was ſuch a Coun- « cil. The *Roman Empire* had the Vanity « to call itſelf the *Oicumene*, which we tranſlate, *all* « *the World.* Luk. 2. ℣. 1. Hence the Councils call'd « within the *Empire* ſtiled themſelves *Oecumenical*, « but no more truly ſo, than the *Roman Empire* was « all the World. But the *Latin Church* was not ſo « much as the *Oicumene* of that *Empire.* For *Greece*, « and other Parts of the *Greek Church* in *Aſia* were « in it; eſpecially after the Seat of the Empire was « tranſlated to *Conſtantinople*, when they contended « with *Rome* for the *Supremacy:* and the *Latin Church* « was not then call'd by the Name of the *Church of* « *Rome.* As the learned *du Pin* ſays in his *Traité de* « *la Puiſſance Eccleſiaſtique*, &c. pag. 551. *It is true* « (ſays he) *that at preſent the Name of the Church of* « *Rome is given to the Catholick Church, and that theſe* « *two Terms paſs for Synonimous. But in Antiquity no* « *more was intended by the Name of the Church of Rome,* « *than the Church of the City of Rome. The Greek Schiſ-* « *maticks ſeem to be the firſt, who gave the Name of the* « *Church of Rome to all the Churches of the Weſt. Whence* « *the Latins made Uſe of this to diſtinguish the Chur-* « *ches, which communicated with the Church of Rome,* « *from the Greeks, who were ſeparated from her Commu-* « *nion. From this came the Cuſtom to give the Name of* « *the Church of Rome to the Catholick Church. But the* « *other Churches did not for this loſe their Name, or their* «

» *Authority*, &c. Then he go's on to vindicate the » *Rights* of every *National Church* independent of the » *Church* of *Rome*, and paſt her Power to controll or » alter. *pag.* 21. 22.

L. Sr, I have already told you (but you are ſomewhat forgetful) that if Popes ſhould pretend to invade the *juſt Rights* or *Privileges* of particular Churches, they may lawfully maintain them, and the learned *du Pin* may be their Advocate, if he pleaſes, without Derogating from the *Supremacy* of St *Peter*, or his *Succeſſors*. But, as to the long Paſſage, you have quoted from him, there is not a Word in it can do you any Service; unleſs you become guilty of the old Equivocation in Confounding the *Dioceſs* or *Patriarchat* of *Rome* with the whole Church in Communion with that *See*.

It is true (ſays *du Pin*) *that at preſent the Name of the Church of Rome is given to the Catholick Church, and theſe Terms paſs for Synonimous.* I anſwer, that *du Pin* certainly means the *whole Church* in Communion with the *See of Rome*. For the learned *du Pin* is not ſuch a Blunderer as to ſay, that the *Dioceſs of Rome*, and the *Catholick Church* paſs for Synonimous Terms.

He go's on. *But in Antiquity no more was intended by the Name of the Church of Rome, than the Church of the City of Rome. And the Popes in their Subſcriptions, or Superſcriptions took ſimply the Quality of Bishop of Rome.*

Very right, Sr. But cannot Cuſtom enlarge the Signification of Words? Or muſt *du Pin* be our Monitor to tell us, that the *Dioceſs of Rome* was not formerly the whole *Catholick Church*? Or that the *Catholick Church* was not always call'd by the Name of the *Church* of *Rome*? The *Latin Church* was not always call'd by that Name, yet I think the *Latin Church* was always the *Latin Church*, as the *Greek Church* was always the *Greek Church*, tho it had not always that Name; and as *Chriſ-*

tians were always *Chriſtians*, tho they were not call'd ſo till there was a Church founded at *Antioch*. What therefore *du Pin* ſays concerning the Occaſion of the different Appellations to diſtinguiſh the two *Churches* from one another, is nothing to the Purpoſe. If he had ſaid, that *the whole Church in Communion with the See of Rome was not anciently the Catholick Church*, this indeed would have been a ſweet Bit for you. But *du Pin* is too good a *Papiſt* to write in that extravagant Manner.

As to the *Subſcriptions* or *Superſcriptions* uſed by Popes, I preſume you would not have them fill up whole Pages with pompous Titles like the *Grand Senior*: or Kings of *Perſia*. Nay every Pope ſince St *Gregory's* Time has only ſtiled himſelf, *the Servant of the Servants of God*. But this never hinder'd them from Aſſerting their *Supremacy* againſt any one, that offer'd to attack it. Thus much then for *du Pin's* Words. Let us now conſider what you have ſaid yourſelf.

You tell me, *there never was a General Council*. Sr, if you ſpeak the uſual Language of *Chriſtendom*, you have it entirely againſt you. Nay your own Church allows of the 4 *firſt General Councils*, and calls them by that Name. But if you coin Notions, which no Man ever thought of, what you ſay may be true, but I am ſure 'tis nothing to the Purpoſe.

You add, that *becauſe the Roman Empire had the Vanity to call itſelf the Oicumene, hence the Councils call'd within that Empire ſtiled themſelves Oecumenical, or General*. But I ſhould be glad to know, where you learnt this Piece of profound Erudition. For pray, Sr, were there not innumerable *National* and *Provincial* Councils held within the *Empire*, which yet never ſtiled themſelves *Oecumenical* or *General*? The true Reaſon therefore why the other Councils were

ſo ſtiled, was becauſe the *Catholick* Bishops of all *Nations* were invited to them; and there was a ſufficient Number preſent at them to make them the *Repreſentatives* of the whole *Catholick Church*.

Your Obſervation, *that the Latin Church was not ſo much as the Oicumene of the Empire*; is juſt as much to the Purpoſe, as if you should tell me that *Greece* is not in *Italy*, or that it was not ſubject to the *Patriarchat* of *Rome*; which no Man ever dreamt of. For the *Popes* pretend not to the *Supremacy* either as *Bishops* or *Patriarchs* of *Rome*, but as *Succeſſors* of St *Peter*. And ſo the Queſtion is not, how far the *Patriarchal Juriſdiction* of *Rome* (which is commonly call'd the *Latin Church*) is extended; but whether the *Bishop* of *Rome* be not the *Head* of the *Catholick Church*, preciſely as he is the *Succeſſor* of St *Peter*?

As to what you add, viz. *that after the Empire was tranſlated to Conſtantinople, the Greek Church contended with Rome for the Supremacy*, I have already shew'd the Falſehood of it. §. 9. So you may now proceed, if you pleaſe.

§. 19.

Mr Talon's *Speech in the* Parliament *of* Paris *againſt* Innocent *XI. misrepreſented.*

» *G.* THe *Proceedings* of the *Parliament* of *Paris* » (Appen. p. 39. 40.) tells the Pope, that » his *Bishoprick* extends only to the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, » and his *Patriarchat* to the Provinces call'd *Subur-* » *bicarial*. And that by taking upon him to excom- » municate others unjuſtly, and where his Power » did not reach, he had excommunicated himſelf. » And then he was ſo far from being *Head*, that » he was not ſo much as a *Member* of the Church.

And

id they mind him, as likewiſe *du Pin* in the « eatiſe above-mention'd, *pag.* 263. of the ſtout « ſiſtance made by the Bishops of *France* to the « pe who threaten'd to excommunicate all of « em, that would not ſubmit to his Deciſion. But « ey reſolutely anſwer'd, that they would not ſub- « t to his Will; and that if he came to excom- « unicate them, he should go back excommuni- « ed himſelf. *Si excommunicaturus veniret, excom-* « *municatus abiret.* Now what is that *Head*, can be « communicated by it's *Members?* What is that « *premacy* can be limited, and controll'd by it's « *bjects?* And of which they are the Judges, and « a ſay to it as God to the Sea: *hitherto ſhalt* « *u come and no farther, here ſhall thy proud Waves* « *ſtaid?* pag. 22. 23. «

ADVERTISEMENT.

N. B. That the Piece here quoted by the Gentleman *is printed in the* Appendix *of his* Caſe ſtated. *Beginning* pag. 39. *and Ending* pag. 52. *And tho it be the Harangue of an* Advocate General *in Defence of the* Franchiſes *of the* Gallicane *Church, fill'd with many warm Expreſſions, but too uſual in the Heat of Diſputes, yet the* Gentleman *is pleaſed to lay as much Streſs upon it as if it were a* Dogmatical *Piece approved by all* Catholick Divines. *But, what is ſtill more ſurprizing, tho the* Gentleman *had the Piece before him, yet in the ſmall Part, he has quoted of it, he is guilty of two* Falſifications: *whether voluntary, or involuntary I refer to the Reader.*

SIR, we have the *Proceedings* of the *Parliament* of *Paris* here before us: that is, Mr *Talon's*

warm Speech againſt the Bull of *Innocent* XI. But you have made him ſay more, than he really did or ever thought of.

For *firſt*, you ſay he tells the Pope, *that his Biſhoprick extends only to the Dioceſs of Rome, and his Patriarchat to the Provinces call'd Suburbicarial.* Whereas Mr *Talon's* Words are no more than an expoſtulatory Interrogation, and can bear no ſuch Meaning any more than a Child can be ſaid to diſown the *Authority* of his *Father*, if thinking himſelf injured he ſhould ask him in an expoſtulatory Way, *whether he meant to renounce that Title?*

Mr *Talon's* Words are theſe. *Is it that the Pope means to have no more Commerce with France? Is he perſuaded that his Power reaches no farther than the Dioceſs of Rome, and his Patriarchſhip than the Neighbouring Provinces ſtiled Suburbicarial? Do's he intend to renounce the Quality of Head of the Church and common Father of the Faithful?* (Appen. pag. 43. 44.) Now let any Man Judge whether you have quoted him fairly. Nay his laſt Words imply no leſs, than an Acknowledgment of the Pope's being the *Head of the Church*, and *common Father of the Faithful:* which in Reality is the Point in Queſtion betwixt us. For what is it to the Purpoſe how far the *Biſhoprick* or *Patriarchat* of *Rome* is extended? Our Queſtion is preciſely concerning the Pope's *Supremacy*, to which he has no Title but preciſely as he is the *Succeſſor* of St *Peter*. And this Mr *Talon* acknowledges, *pag.* 49. Appen. and promiſes that the *Gallicane Church* will always maintain *Communion* with the *See* of *Rome:* which you know very well is impracticable without Owning the *Supremacy*.

2dly, you quote that Part of Mr *Talon's* Speech, where he puts the Pope in Mind of the ſtout Reſiſtance made by the Biſhops of *France* in the Reign of *Lewis the Debonnaire* againſt Pope *Gregory* IV. who

en'd to excommunicate them, *if they did not ith his Designs*, as it is expreſs'd in the *Append.* 2. tho you expreſs it, *if they would not ſubmit to ciſion:* I preſume, this was to inſinuate, that refuſed to ſubmit to ſome *Deciſion* of *Faith*, as the whole Diſpute was about a meer *Party*. But they reſolutely anſwer'd, *that if he came to unicate them, he should himſelf return excommu-d.*

very true, that Mr *Talon* quotes this bold r of the *French* Bishops to *Gregory* the 4th. ou are not content with this, but likewiſe tell hat in the *Proceedings* of the *Parliament* of *Pa-* ſame Language is uſed to *Innocent XI.* For Words are theſe. *And the Proceedings of the nent of Paris tell the Pope* [i. e. *Innocent* XI.] *s Bishoprick, &c. ----- And that by taking upon excommunicate others unjuſtly, and where his Power reach, he had excommunicated himſelf.* Yet there a Word of all this in Mr *Talon's* Speech; as one may be ſatisfied, that will but give him- e Trouble to read your *Appendix.*

you make the *French Advocate General* ſay the *French* Bishops. For *Gregory* IV. was by nly threaten'd, *that if he came to excommunicate he should himſelf return excommunicated.* The neſs of which Expreſſion is very much molli- M. *Talon* himſelf Appen. p. 42. 43. But poor XI. (if you can make good your Quota- is by the *Advocate General* poſitively declared municated *for having taken upon him to excom- te others unjuſtly, and where his Power did not* And you make this ſmart Reflection upon it; *was then ſo far from being Head, that he was much as a Member of the Church.* But ſince the tion is grounded upon a Fact of your own

fruitful Invention (which I aſſure you will not make you paſs for the niceſt Lover of Truth in the World) we may piouſly hope, that *Innocent* XI. died not only a *Member*, but the *Head* of the *Catholick Church.*

But the *French* Bishops telling Pope *Gregory*, that *if he came to excommunicate them, he should himſelf return excommunicated*, puts you upon theſe vehement Interrogatories. *Now what is that Head can be excommunicated by it's Members? What is that Supremacy can be limited and controll'd by it's Subjects?* Which I shall endeavour to match with ſome Interrogatories of the ſame kind, viz. *What Head both of Church and State is that Man, whoſe Head can be cut off by his Subjects? And what is that Sovereignty, which can be limited and controll'd by Laws?* Now whatever Anſwer you'll give to theſe impertinent Queſtions of mine, will probably ſerve to anſwer yours.

But, to return to what we were ſaying before concerning *Councils*, tho the *Supremacy* was given to St *Peter*, and by Conſequence to his *Succeſſors* in Order to perpetuate the Form of *Church-government* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, yet it is no Article of Faith with us, that St *Peter's Infallibility*, which he had in common with the other *Apoſtles*, was likewiſe to be tranſmitted to his *Succeſſors.* And therefore we are only ſure, that *Chriſt* has promiſed *Infallibility* to his *Church*, the Repreſentative whereof is a *General Council.*

§. 20.

Of General Councils.

G. WHich, as I told you, never was, and is next to impoſſible ever should be. And what you have ſaid gives up your whole Founda-

tion. For the *Popes*, and not *Councils* pretend to be « the *Succeſſors* of St *Peter*, and Heirs of all the Pro- « miſes made to him. *pag.* 23. «

L. Not of *all* with your good Leave, Sr. For *Chriſt* promiſed St *Peter*, that he should be a *Martyr*. Joh. 21. ℣. 18. But all Popes pretend not to be *Martyrs*. The Popes are therefore the *Succeſſors* of St *Peter*, and as ſuch the *ſupreme Governors* of the Church. But *General Councils* are the *Repreſentatives* of this Church, and to her *Chriſt* promiſed *Infallibility*. So that you are grievouſly out in ſaying, *that we give up the whole Foundation* in not Lodging the *Infallibility* as well as *Supremacy* in the *Pope*. For this is a Queſtion diſputed amongſt our Divines, and the Negative as well as *Affirmative* may be held without endangering the *Foundation* of the Church.

As to your Repeating, *that there never was a General Council*, I refer you to my former Anſwer, and am ſorry you can entertain the ſame Whim ſo long together.

G. My Lord, you are not agreed among your- « ſelves concerning *general Councils*. *Bellarmin* (de « Conc. L. 1. C. 6.) gives a Liſt of *General Councils*, « which are to be rejected. *Concilia generalia repro-* « *bata*. Some for not being approved by the *Pope*; « ſome for *Hereſy*, and ſome (he might have ſaid « all) as not being received by the *Univerſal Church*. « But he meant only the *Church of Rome*. p. 23. «

L. Under Favour, Sr, he meant the *whole Church* in Communion with the *See of Rome*; which is call'd the *Catholick* or *Univerſal Church* not only by *Bellarmin*, but alſo by St *Auſtin* (contra Epiſt fund. C. 4.) and indeed the whole Current of *Orthodox Fathers*. And this Church has received a great many *general Councils*; the Decrees whereof in Doctrinal Points are infallible Rules of Faith. But pray go on.

» *G.* Ch. 7. is of *General Councils* partly *confirm'd*, » and partly *reprobated*. And Chap. 8. is of *general* » *Councils* neither manifeſtly *approved*, nor manifeſt- » ly *rejected*. This is going through all the Degrees » of Uncertainty. And Chap. 5. and *de Rom. Pont.* » L. 4. C. 11. he ſays, that ſeveral Things in thoſe » *Councils* allow'd to be *General* were foiſted in by *He-* » *reticks*, he knows not how. This was to get rid of » ſome Objections againſt *thoſe Councils*, he could » not anſwer otherwiſe-----

L. Sr, you should have ſaid, *againſt ſome private Opinions of his own.* But let us hear out the reſt of your Story.

» *G.* And (*de Eccl. Milit.* C. 16.) he quotes the » laſt *Council* of *Lateran* condemning the Council of » *Baſil*, which he ſays was at firſt a true *Oecumenical* » Council, and infallible, but afterwards turn'd in- » to a *Schiſmatical Conventicle*, and was of no Autho- » rity at all. *pag.* 23. 24.

L. Well, Sr, the Sum of all this is, that *Bellarmin* rejects ſome Councils *abſolutely*, which falſly ſtiled themſelves *General*. As that of *Sardica* conſiſting of 76 *Arian* Biſhops, who ſeparated themſelves from the *true Council* of *Sardica*, yet call'd themſelves by that Name, and condemn'd St *Athanaſius*. The other *reprobate General Councils* mention'd by *Bellarmin* are of the ſame Kidney; But I hope you do not imagine we place the *Infallibility* in ſuch Councils as theſe. He likewiſe ſays that the Authority of ſome Councils call'd *General* is *doubtful*, and that ſome are partly *approved*, and partly *rejected*; which you ſay *is Going through all the Degrees of Uncertainty.* But what do you pretend to infer from thence?

G. My Lord, I infer from it that no *Infallibility* can be placed in *General Councils.*

L. Sr, if we had no Councils but of a *ſuſpected*

and *uncertain* Authority, I should eaſily ſubſcribe to what you ſay. But have we not *general Councils* enough unanimouſly received and approved by the whole Body of the *Catholick Church*, and in which all doctrinal Points of Controverſy are fully and clearly determined? Theſe then are the Councils, the Deciſions whereof we regard as *infallible* Rules of *Faith:* becauſe they are the true *Repreſentatives* of that Church, to which *Chriſt* has promiſed his *perpetual Aſſiſtance*, and which in all Ages is the *Pillar and Ground of Truth* no leſs than she was in the firſt Age of Chriſtianity. So that the *Spuriouſneſs* or *Uncertainty* of ſome Councils ſtiled *General*, and the *Illegality* of ſome Part of others cannot be turn'd into an Argument of any Weight againſt the *Certainty* and *Infallibility* of other Councils univerſally received and approved, any more than the *Authority* of legal *Parliaments* can be queſtion'd, becauſe there have been ſome very *illegal* ones, ſome partly *legal*, and partly *illegal*, and others of a *doubtful* Authority.

But, to inſtance in a Caſe exactly parallel, Sr, there were *ſpurious Goſpels* handed about even in the Time of the Apoſtles. And Dr *Walton* an eminent *Proteſtant* Writer aſſures us poſitively (for the Fact is unqueſtionable) *that the Book of Revelations, and ſome other Parts of the New Teſtament were doubted of for ſome Ages.* In Proleg. C. 4. §. 6. pag. 31. Thus likewiſe the Books of *Ezra* are partly *Canonical*, and partly *Apocriphal* in the Judgment of your Church as well as ours: Nay you have likewiſe *ſplit* the Prophecy of *Daniel*, the two laſt Chapters whereof are wholly omitted in your *Bible.* Here then we have certain *ſpurions* Scriptures *entirely rejected*, ſome of the *Canonical* ones *doubted* of for ſeveral Ages, and others *partly approved* and *partly rejected:* Yet I hope

no *Chriſtian* will make theſe parallel Facts an Objection againſt the *Certainty* and *Infallibility* of *Scriptures.* And, if theſe be no Objection againſt *Scriptures*, as moſt certainly they are not, neither are thoſe, you have collected from *Bellarmin*, of any Moment againſt *General Councils.* For whatever you anſwer to theſe, is a full anſwer to your own Objection, which by Proving too much, proves nothing at all. And what elſe then have you done by Starting this Objection but furniſh'd the Enemies of *Chriſtianity* with Arms againſt it? For they cannot be ſo ſtupid as not to ſee, that what you ſay to weaken the *Authority* of *Councils*, ſtrikes with equal Force as the *Authority* of *Scriptures.*

But what muſt we then rely ſecurely upon both as to *Scriptures* and *Councils?* Sr, if St *Paul* has not deceived us in Calling the *Catholick Church* the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, 1. Tim. 3. ℣. 15. the Weight and Authority of her Judgment is our only Security, and alone ſufficient to remove all reaſonable doubts. So that whatever Diſputes are yet Remaining either concerning *Scriptures* or *Councils*, the *Catholick Church* alone has full Power given her by *Chriſt* to determine them: And *he, that do's not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen and a Publican.* Math. 18. ℣. 17.

As to what you ſay concerning the *Council* of *Baſil*, it was at firſt a regular Council aſſembled by, and united to it's *Head* till the 25th *Seſſion*; when there aroſe a Diſpute concerning Removing the Council to a more convenient Place for a Treaty with the *Greeks.* The greateſt Part of the Bishops ſtuck to their *Head.* But a ſmall Number of Bishops, and many of the inferiour *Clergy* remain'd at *Baſil*, and continued to ſtile themſelves the *General Council* of that Place. But were no more the true Council, than

ian if a few Members remaining at *Weſtminſter* would
e the true *Parliament*, if the King by his Authority
ıould remove it to another Place.

G. My Lord, the Church of *France* receives the «
Councils of *Baſil* and *Conſtance* wholly and through- «
ut. But the *Church* of *Rome* rejects both in Part. «
ag. 24. «

L. Sr, you are under a Miſtake in Saying, that he *Church of France* receives the *Council of Baſil* whol- y and throughout. For *Charles* VII. who was then ing of *France*, as likewiſe the *Emperor*, and other rinces, rejected the Decree of that Council againſt ope *Eugenius*, continuing ſtill to acknowledge him or Pope. *Du Pin*, Cent. 15. p. 48. And the whole hurch has received both the Council of *Baſil* and *onſtance* as to all their Decrees relating to *Faith*. When I ſay *the whole Church*, I mean neither *Here- icks*, nor *Schiſmaticks*, who are cut off from the *Ca- holick Church*.

G. My Lord, ſince there are theſe Diſputes about *ouncils*, it follows that » they, who place the *In-* « *allibility* in *Councils*, will need another *Infallible* « Judge to determine theſe Diſputes concerning « *ouncils*; Which are *truly general*, and which not: « And which are *partly* ſo, and which *throughout*: « And what Part of thoſe, that are *throughout*, have « been corrupted by *Heretick*s; if that can be call'd « rue *throughout*, which is corrupted *in any Part*: And « vhen one Council codemns another, which ſhall « ve believe? *pag.* 24. «

L. Sr, all theſe Points will be fully clear'd by nly ſhewing the Miſtake of your firſt Propoſition, *viz. that they, who place the Infallibility in Councils, will need another infallible Judge to determine theſe Diſputes concerning the Concils.* Which I deny. Becauſe every *Supreme Tribunal*, from which there is no *Appeal*, is

the *only Judge* in all Caſes relating to itſelf. Thus a *legal Parliament*, which is the *ſupreme Tribunal* of *Great Britain*, is the only Judge that can decide all *Parliamentary* Diſputes. As, whether it was legally convened: What Number is requiſite to make it a *Repreſentative* of the Nation: Whether the *Rump-Parliament* was truly a *Parliament*: Whether the *long Parliament*, which was call'd by *Charles* the *firſt*, and at length cut off his Head, was a true Parliament *throughout*, or only *in Part*: And finally, when one *Parliament* condemns another (whereof there are Inſtances enough) which of them had Reaſon on it's Side and which not. As therefore it is falſe to ſay, that they, who place the *ſupreme Authority* of the Nation in a *legal Parliament*, will need another *Supreme Tribunal* to determine *Parliamentary* Diſputes, ſo it is no leſs falſe to ſay, that they who place the *Infallibility* in a *General Council* (which is the *Repreſentative* of the *Catholick Church*, to which *Chriſt* has promiſed *Infallibility**) will need another *Infallible Judge* to determine Diſputes concerning *Councils*. For the Caſe is exactly parallel.

As to your pleaſant Reflection concerning true *General Councils throughout*, yet corrupted *in ſome Part*: I have already told you, that no *General Council* is corrupted in any Thing relating to *Faith*: which is a ſufficient Anſwer to it.

» *G.* If we muſt not believe every Council, that » calls itſelf *Oecumenical*, we can believe no other » Council againſt it for the ſame Reaſon. *pag.* 24.

L. No, Sr! That's very ſtrange. For according to this Logick every *Schiſmatical* Aſſembly, that but dub's itſelf *Council*, is of the ſame Authority as the great *Concil of Nice*.

» *G.* The 2d Council of *Epheſus* is generally con- demn'd in your Church: yet it call'd itſelf *Oecu-*

menical, and was as much as any of the others. « *pag.* 24. «

L. Generally, do you ſay, Sr? You ſhould have ſaid *Univerſally* by all *Chriſtian Churches* in the World, except the *Eutychians*. But as to your Saying, *that it was as much a General Council as any other*, Really, Sr, this is Expoſing yourſelf too much. For the noble Council, you are pleaſed to patronize, was in all Antiquity ſo infamous for the Violences and Barbarities committed in it, that it never deſerv'd any better Character, than that of *Latrocinium Epheſinum*: that is, the *Band of Epheſian Rioters and Aſſaſines*.

G. But what a Thing is it to ſay that a *Council* « is *partly Right*, and *partly Wrong?* pag. 24. «

L. Or rather what a Thing is it to make a Wonder of it? Unleſs you mean, that a Council legally aſſembled, and truly *General*, ſhould in Deciding Matters of *Faith* be *partly Right*, and *partly Wrong*; which indeed is impoſſible, and was never thought of, much leſs maintain'd by any *Catholick* Divine. But that an Aſſembly, which was *legal at firſt*, ſhould by a Separation from it's *Head*, and the greateſt Part of it's Members become *illegal* afterwards, yet continue to ſtile itſelf a *General Council*, I think is no ſuch ſtrange Thing as you make it. Nay 'tis the very Caſe of the Council of *Baſil*: which therefore may properly be call'd a *Concil*, that was *partly Right*, and *partly Wrong*: like the long *Parliament*, which was *Right* at firſt, but very *Wrong* in the End.

G. But who is Judge of the *Right* or *Wrong* of « ſuch Councils? Is there any *Certainty* in this, far « leſs *Infallibility?* pag. 24. «

L. Sr, the *Church* of *Chriſt* is the Judge of it; as I have already told you. And St *Auſtin* calls is *a Point of the moſt inſolent Madneſs* not to ſubmit to her Judgment.

» *G.* But we muſt have an *infallible* Method too » to preſerve the *Acts* of the *Councils*, that they be » not adulterated, as *Bellarmin* ſays they have been: » And they continue ſo to this Day in the Volumes » of the Councils. Why then are they not amen- » ded, and theſe *Suppoſititious* and *adulterated* Parts » (theſe are *Bellarmin's* own Words) ſtruk out? » But the ſeveral Editions of their own Councils are » in the Hands of other *Churches*, and therefore they » can make no Alteration in them without being » detected. *pag.* 24. 25.

L. I dare ſwear, Sr, this is not *Bellarmin's* Reaſon, why they are not amended. But I can give you a good Reaſon for it. *viz.* Becauſe they, who put forth the Councils, were not of *Bellarmin's* Opinion. And therefore Judging the Acts, which he calls *Suppoſititious* (tho they regard no Matters of *Faith*, as I have told you) to be *Genuine*, thought fit to make no Alteration in them, but left them as they found them.

As to the Method of *Preſerving Councils* from Corruptions; I preſume the ſame Method, which ſuffices to preſerve the *Bible*, will likewiſe ſuffice to preſerve the *Councils* from being corrupted.

» *G.* My Lord, the *Scheme* of *Infallibility*, which » you place in *Councils*, ſtands thus. The *Church of* » *Rome* makes herſelf the *Univerſal* or *Catholick* » *Church:* in ſo much that all, who are not of her » *Communion* (which are by far the greateſt Part of » *Chriſtian Churches* in the World) are out of the » Pale of the *Catholick Church*. And *Schiſmaticks* and » *Hereticks* are no Part of a *Catholick Council*. Thus a » ſmall Part of the *Latin Church* (excluſive of the » *Greek*, and all other Churches) are the whole *Ca-* » *tholick Church*. And theſe little *Party-Councils* under » the Direction of the Pope are *Univerſal* and *Infal-* » *lible*. pag. 25.

§. 21.

A General Council *is the* Repreſentative *of the* Catholick Church *only.*

L. I Muſt own, Sr, the pleaſant *Scheme* you have drawn for me, is a good Proof of your admirable Skill in Romancing, as the following plain Account of the naked Truth will teſtify.

Chriſt has eſtabliſh'd a *Church* on Earth, which in the *Creed* is call'd the *Catholick* or *Univerſal* Church, tho it never was, and perhaps never will be the *Church* of *all Nations* in ſuch a Manner, as to have the *Univerſal World* all at once in her Communion. He conſtituted St *Peter Head* of this Church, when at the *third Apparition* after his *Reſurrection* he gave him a Commiſſion diſtinct from what he had given to the Apoſtles in Common at his *firſt Apparition.* And, ſince the Form of *Church-government* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt* was not to End with St *Peter*, his *Succeſſors* choſen by the Church hold the ſame Station as he did, and *Rome* is their *Epiſcopal See.* Hence it is, that the Church in Communion with the *See of Rome*, that is, with the *Succeſſors* of St *Peter*, who are call'd *Popes*, is the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, and, by Conſequence, the *Catholick Church* profeſs'd in the *Creed.*

This Church admits no *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks* into her Communion: And indeed a *Catholick Heretick* or *Schiſmatick* is a *Chimera* unheard of in Antiquity. So that let them be as numerous as they pleaſe, they are out of the Pale of the *Catholick Church*, and can have no other Place in a *Catholick Council* than ſuch as *Criminals* have in a Court of Juſticature. And thus it is, that the Church in Commu-

nion with the *See of Rome* (excluſive of all *Heretick*s and *Schiſmatick*s) is the whole *Catholick Church:* and ſuch *Councils*, as are true *Repreſentatives* of this Church, are *General*, and *Infallible* in all their Deciſions relating to Matters of *Faith*.

Let me tell you, Sr, this plain Scheme will ſtand it's Ground againſt yours in Spite of all the artful Miſrepreſentations you have crouded into it, eſpecially that, which is the Foundation of your whole *Sham-ſcheme*, viz: *that the Church of Rome makes herſelf the Univerſal or Catholick Church.* For you either mean the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, and then what you ſay is falſe. Becauſe tis manifeſt the *Dioceſs* of *Rome* never pretended to be the *whole Catholick Church.* Or you mean the whole Church in Communion with the *See* of *Rome*, and then you are guilty of Miſrepreſentation in Saying that this Church *makes herſelf* the *Catholick* or *Univerſal* Church. For she do's not *make herſelf*, but *Chriſt*, who conſtituted St *Peter*, and his *Succeſſors* the *Heads* of his Church, has made her the *Catholick Church.*

» *G.* My Lord, I have shewn, that the *Church* of » *Rome* has no Right to the *Title* of the *Latin Church* » itſelf, far leſs of the *Univerſal.* And she has now » but a ſmall Part of the *Latin Church* left her. The » *Reform'd* with *Ruſſia*, and the *Greek Church* will out- » number her in *Europe.* And she has no *National* » Church in her Communion any where elſe. And, » tho there be ſome in her Communion in moſt » Countries, there are not ſo many as of the *Jews*, » who by that are more *Univerſal* than your Church, » and ſo more *Catholick.* And none of the ſhatter'd » Seminaries of *Rome* in other *Chriſtian Churches* can » be ſaid to repreſent thoſe Churches in a *General* » *Council* more, than three or four Bishops in *Eng-* » *land* could repreſent the *Church* of *England* as it

ıow ſtands. But on the Contrary their living in a «
ɛparate Communion in other *Chriſtian Churches* «
ıhews theſe Churches not to be of her Commu- «
ıion; and therefore cannot be repreſented in any «
of their Councils: and theſe calling themſelves «
Oecumenical, as the *Roman Empire* did shews only, «
how *little Criticiſms* upon Words will avail againſt «
plain Matter of Fact: which I have shew'd to be «
:he Caſe as to thoſe *Texts* urged for the *Supremacy* «
of St *Peter*. And that if Words would do it, there «
are more nay and *Facts* too for the *univerſal Supre-* «
macy of St *Paul*, at leaſt over all the *Chriſtian Chur-* «
ches of the *Gentiles*, which are all now in the World. «
Pag. 25. 26. «

L. Sr, you neither have shew'd, nor ever can ſhew, that the Texts urged for the *Supremacy* of St *Peter* are meer *Criticiſms* upon Words; unleſs you can prove that the Ancient *Fathers*, I have produced, did only trifle with Words; and deliver'd not in their Writings the *publick Faith* of the Church in their Times. For all, that had Occaſion to write upon that ſubject, urged thoſe *Texts* for the *Supremacy* of St *Peter*. And I defy you to name me one Father, who ever urged either one ſingle *Text* or *Fact* for the *Supremacy* of St *Paul*. And how then can you imagine, that any Man will believe you, when you ſay, there are more *Texts* and *Facts* for St *Paul*, than St *Peter*? Let me tell you, Sr, once more, this is an Argument you can never anſwer.

However I find two Things true in the Harangue you have made; which is a kind of Miracle. 1. That, *Papiſts living in a ſeparate Communion in Proteſtant Countries shews thoſe Churches not to be of their Communion.* Which is juſt as much to the Purpoſe, as if you had told me, that *English Papiſts* are not *English Proteſtants*. And 2dly, *that Proteſtant Churches cannot be*

repreſented in a General Council by the Roman Catholicks, that live amongſt them. As *the Church of England, as it now ſtands, cannot be repreſented by 3 or 4 Popiſh Biſhops.* Which is likewiſe very true, and as little to the Purpoſe as the former. For we are in no Manner of Concern, whether the *Church of England*, or the other *Reform'd Churches* be repreſented in our Councils or not: unleſs it were to be in Order to a Reconciliation to their *Mother-Church.* And I muſt here put you in Mind that even that Mimick of a General Council, the *Synod of Dort*, would not ſuffer the *Arminians* to be preſent at it in any other Quality than as *Criminals* to be Judged.

But I preſume your main Drift is to conclude that our Councils are not *General*, becauſe all *Chriſtian Churches* are not repreſented in thoſe Councils. But you are under a great Miſtake. Becauſe a *Catholick General Council* is only the Repreſentative of the whole diffuſive Body of the *Catholick Church*, and not of *Heretical* or *Schiſmatical* Churches, as I have already told you. And you may as well ſay they are not *General Councils*, becauſe *Quakers* and *Anabaptiſts* are not allow'd to ſend their Repreſentatives to them.

Suppoſe a *National Council* were call'd in *Great Britain*, would you allow *Puritans*, *Independents*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Quakers*, *Browniſts*, *Muggletonians*, *Freethinkers*, and the whole Rifraff of *Engliſh Sects* to ſend Repreſentatives of their reſpective Churches to it to Judge of Matters of *Faith* and *Diſcipline* as well as your *Biſhops*, and the *Epiſcopal Clergy*? No ſurely. And yet it would be a *National Council*, tho all theſe were excluded: becauſe it would repreſent the *National* Church of *Great Britain.* In like Manner a *general* Council of the *Catholick Church* is that, to which all *Catholick* Biſhops are invited. And when you convince me that the *ſeparate* Communions of *Heretick*

Hereticks and *Schiſmaticks* are a Part of the *Catholick Church*. I will then acknowledge, that they have a Title to ſit in her Councils as *Judges*; and that there can be no *general Council*, unleſs they be invited to ſend their Deputies, and Repreſentatives to it.

You ſay, *you have ſhew'd that the Church of Rome has no Right to the Title of the Latin Church itſelf.* But, Sr, I muſt tell you once more, there is a Difference between *Saying* and *Shewing*. However if you mean, that the *Dioceſs* of *Rome* is not the whole *Latin Church*, no Man will diſpute it with you. But if you mean, that the *Biſhops* of *Rome* as they are *Patriarchs* of the *Weſt* (which Title never was denied them) have not Juriſdiction over the *Latin Church*, all Men of Senſe will give it againſt you.

You add, *that the Church of Rome has now but a ſmall Part of the Latin Church left her.* So when a *Sovereign* is ſtripped of the greateſt Part of his Dominions by *Rebellious* Subjects, he has but a *ſmall Part* of his Kingdom left him: but I hope this do's not deveſt him of his Title to the whole. However you are ſomewhat miſtaken in your Calculation: For the *ſmall Part* you ſpeak of is all *Italy*, *France*, and *Spain*. The Kingdoms of *Naples* and *Sicily*. Ten of the 17 Provinces of the *Netherlands*. Eight of the 13 *Swiſh Cantons*. The vaſt Kingdom of *Poland*. All the Emperor's *hereditary Dominions*. All the *Catholick Electorats*, beſides other Parts of the *Empire*, &c. And as to what you ſay, *that ſhe has no National Church in her Communion out of Europe*, I muſt refer you to the *Maps*, and the *Atlas Geographus* for your better Information.

But notwithſtanding all this you have *Uncatholick'd* the poor *Church of Rome* to all Intents and Purpoſes. For, if the *Jews* themſelves be more *Catholick* than the *Church of Rome*, I am ſure ſhe can lay no

Claim to that honourable Title. The Piece is very curious, and ſo I ſhall repeat it Word for Word. *And tho* (ſay you) *there be ſome in her Communion in moſt Countries, there are not ſo many as of the Jews, who by that are more Univerſal than your Church, and ſo more Catholick.* Really, Sr, I know not how far this Argument may tempt a Man to *Circumciſion*, but I am ſure it will never tempt me to be a Member of the *Church of England*: ſince I am very certain that the *Jews* are more diſperſed about in other Countries, than thoſe of your *Church*. And by Conſequence (if your Argument be worth any Thing) they are more *Catholick* than the *Church of England*.

But, if *Jews* be more *Catholick* on that Score, than either of our *Churches*, what noble *Catholicks* muſt *Heathens* and *Mahometans* then be, who are not only far more numerous, but poſſeſs a greater Tract of Land than all the *Chriſtians* in the World! But who would ever imagine a *Divine* capable of Arguing in ſuch a wretched Manner! In good Truth, Sr, I am ſtrongly tempted to ſuſpect you know not what the Word *Catholick* means, tho you have repeated it many Times in your *Creed*. I ſhall therefore explain it at large hereafter to remove all doubts and ſcruples concerning this Piece of profound *Divinity*. But we have digreſs'd from our Subject, which was concerning the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*: and ſince you will not allow them to be *infallible*, let us conſider where the *Infallibility* is to be placed.

§. 22.

The Infallibility *of the* Church.

* *G.* NO where, My Lord. Nor can it be found among Men, who are all *fallible*. pag. 26.

L. What, Sr! Cannot God, if he pleaſes, preſerve Men from Erring! Or were not the ſacred *Penmen infallible* in their Writings! If not, then we are not ſure that the *Scriptures* contain the *Word of God*, which ſurely is *infallible*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

In Anſwer to what the Gentleman *ſpoke laſt, his* Lordship *in the* former Converſation *inſtead of Quoting the* Promiſes *of* Chriſt, *only quotes* Iſaiah, *and* Malachy. *But his Text from* Malachy *(as tranſlated in the* Proteſtant *Bible) being nothing to the Purpoſe is here omitted, and by Conſequence, the* Gentleman's *Anſwer to it. The Words of* Iſaiah *ſhall be examined after his* Lordship's *Anſwer to the following Texts produced by the* Gentleman *againſt the Church's* Infallibility.

THe Word of God tells us, *they were all* « *gone out of the Way. They were together be-* « *me abominable; there was none that did Good, no not* « *t---that all the World might become guilty before* « *d.* Rom. 3. ℣. 12. 19. «

And of the Church it is ſaid. *The whole Head is* « *k, and the whole Heart is faint, there is no ſound-* « *ß in it, but Wounds and Bruiſes, and putrifying* « *res.* Iſa. 1. ℣. 5. 6. «

And God ſays, *mine Heritage is unto me as a Lion* « *the Foreſt. It crieth out againſt me, therefore have I* « *ted it. Mine Heritage is unto me as a ſpeckled Bird,* « *c.* Jer. 12. ℣. 8. 9. «

And we have now long ſince ſeen the *Church* of « *: Jews*, to whom the *Promiſes* were made, quite « *:own off*, and the Church of the *Gentiles* come « *o it's Place. pag.* 27. «

L. I know of no Promiſes of perpetual *Infallibility* ever made to the *Jewiſh Church*, and the *Texts*, you have produced againſt that of the *Church* of *Chriſt*, are juſt as much to the Purpoſe, as if you had quoted the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*.

The *firſt* indeed may prove, that both *Jews* and *Gentiles* are all under Sin. *Rom.* 3. *v.* 9. (till they be juſtified by *Chriſt.*) But what is that to the Church's *Infallibility* in Matters of *Faith.*

The *ſecond* (if we believe the *Prophet* himſelf *v.* 1.) is ſaid of *Juda* and *Jeruſalem.* And how then can you underſtand his Words of the *Catholick Church?*

The *third* deſcribes the *Synagogue* crying out againſt her Lord, *crucify him, crucify him.* But let us hear, how St *Auſtin* anſwer'd the *Donatiſts* urging the like *Texts. The Scripture* (ſays he) *often reprehends the Wicked, that are in the Church, as if all were ſuch, and none at all remain'd Good* -------- *wherefore theſe Men either out of Ignorance or Malice gather ſuch Texts from the Scripture, as are found to be ſpoke againſt the Wicked, who will continue mix'd with the Good to the World's End. Or elſe of the Deſolation of the former People, the Jews. And theſe they endeavour by a forced Conſtruction to urge againſt God's Church: that she may ſeem in a Manner to have fail'd by a General Defection. But, if they will anſwer theſe Writings, let them never produce ſuch Texts any more.* L. de Unit. Eccl. C. 13.

Thus, Sr, you ſee what St *Auſtin* thought of theſe Texts: which you have only pick'd up at ſecond Hand after the *Donatiſts*, and are full as good to diſprove the Circulation of the Blood, as the *Church's Infallibility.*

But God's Promiſe deliver'd by the Mouth of *Iſaiah*, that *his Spirit ſhall never depart from his Church*, ſuffices alone to confute the ſtrain'd Senſe, which the *Donatiſts* put upon the foremention'd Texts. His

Words are theſe. *My Spirit that is upon thee, and my Words, which I have put into thy Mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy Mouth: nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed; nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed's Seed; Says the Lord from hence forth and for ever.* Iſa. 50. ℣. 21.

G. My Lord, this Promiſe was firſt made to the « *Jewiſh Church*, and belongs literally to her, and « much more unconteſtably than to the *Church of* « *Rome*, to whom no Promiſe whatſoever was made. « Nor has she any other Pretence to the Promiſes « made to the *Church* in *General*, than her ſuppoſed « *Supremacy* over all the other *Chriſtian* Churches, « which is diſputed with her, and denied by the o- « ther Churches. But there was none to dipute it « with the *Jewiſh Church:* for she was then the only « *viſible Church* of God upon Earth. And if the Pro- « miſes made to her can fail, in vain do's the *Church* « *of Rome*, or even the whole *Gentile Church* claim « theſe Promiſes as indefeaſible and unalterable to « her. For, if the Promiſes made to the whole Church « of God upon Earth can fail at one Time, they may « likewiſe at another, and there can be no Certain- « ty. *pag.* 28. «

L. Sr, your firſt Propoſition, which is the Groundwork of all the reſt, viz. *that the Promiſe of Iſaiah was firſt made to the Jewiſh Church, and belongs literally to her*, is without the leaſt Foundation of Truth. To make Good what I ſay, I ask whether the *Church*, which the *Meſſias* at his Coming was to eſtabliſh upon Earth, was the *Jewiſh* or *Chriſtian* Church?

G. The latter without all Diſpute.

L. I ask again, whether it be not the *Chriſtian* Church, the future Splendor whereof the Prophet deſcribes by the *Concourſe of Nations* flocking to her. *Iſa.* 60. ℣. 1. 2. &c.

G. There can be no doubt of it.

L. This, Sr, ſuffices to decide to whole Matter. For the Promiſe in Queſtion is *literally* and *ſolely* made to *this Church*; being placed between two *Prophecies*, which are both relating to the *Chriſtian* Church alone. 'Tis usher'd in by that, which foretells the Eſtablishment of the *Church* by the Coming of the *Meſſias*: which can be no other than the *Chriſtian* Church. And it is immediately follow'd by the other, which contains a Deſcription of her future *Encreaſe* and *Splendor*. And I leave any one to Judge, whether it be conſiſtent with good Senſe to underſtand both the Predictions *literally* and *ſolely* of the *Chriſtian Church*, and the *Promiſe*, which has a manifeſt Connection with them, of the *Jewish*.

Thus, Sr, the Foundation, you have laid, is rotten, and the Superſtructure, you have built upon it, muſt fall of Courſe. However to ſupport it, you have again Recourſe to that wretched Equivocation relating to the *Church of Rome*, and therefore can mean nothing elſe but the *Dioceſs of Rome*, to which you ſay *no Promiſe whatſoever was made*. And who ſays the Contrary? The Promiſes were made to *that Church*, whereof St *Peter* was conſtituted *Head*, and his *Succeſſors* after him: that is, to the *Church of Chriſt*, or *Catholick Church* in General. You add: *Nor has she any other Pretence to the Promiſes made to the Church in General but her ſuppoſed Supremacy over all other Chriſtian Churches, which is diſputed with her and denied by the other Churches.* Sr, the Church in Communion with the *Succeſſors* of St *Peter* is the *whole Catholick Church*, to which the Promiſes were made: and the ſupreme Government of this Church is lodg'd in it's Biſhop, preciſely as he is the *Succeſſor* of St *Peter*, and *Chriſt's Vicar* upon Earth. And they, who diſpute that Title with him, may much more legally diſpute the Title to the Crown with

their *lawful Sovereign*, the one being of *Divine*, the other of *human* Inſtitution only.

What you add, *that there was none to diſpute the Supremacy with the Jewiſh Church:* if you mean, that the *Jewiſh Church* itſelf was *ſupreme*, I have not Penetration enough to make Senſe of it. For ſince, as you ſay, she was the *only viſible Church of God* upon Earth, how could she be call'd *ſupreme*, which implies a Compariſon? She had indeed a *high Prieſt*, who govern'd her as *Head*; and in whom we may ſay the *Supremacy* was lodg'd. But let me tell you, Sr, this was diſputed by the *Schiſmatical Churches*, that were amongſt the *Jews*, as thoſe of the *Samaritans* and *Saducees*, who diſown'd the ſupreme *Authority* of the *high Prieſt*, as much as you do that of the *Pope*.

The Argument, you conclude with, is wholly built upon the Suppoſition, that a Promiſe of *perpetual Infallibility* was made to the *Jewiſh Church*, which never has been, nor ever will be proved. For, if ſuch a Promiſe had been made, it would certainly have had it's Effect; unleſs you will ſay, that God's Promiſes can fail.

G. No that's impoſſible. But we may miſtake « his Promiſes, and not underſtand them aright. « And we may not perform the *Conditions* required. « *pag.* 28. «

L. But, Sr, the Promiſes of *Infallibility* made to the *Church of Chriſt* are *Poſitive* and *Unconditional*.

G. There is ſtill a *Condition* implied. That is, of « *Obedience:* which our Saviour has fully exempli- « fied in the Parable of the *Husbandmen*, who did « not render the *Fruits* of the *Vineyard*. pag. 28.

§. 23.

All God's Promiſes are not Conditional.

L. I Deſire you, Sr, to quote the *Goſpel*, *Chapter*, and *Verſe*, that we may examine the *Parable*, you mention.

G. The *Parable* is related both by St *Mathew*. C. 21. ℣. 33. &c. and by St *Luke*. C. 20. ℣. 9. &c.

L. Very well, Sr. And you produce this Parable as a *full Example*, that *all Promiſes* made to the *Chriſtian* Church are *conditional*.

G. I do, My Lord.

L. And truly, Sr, you muſt have a good Aſſurance to do it. For the *Chriſtian Church* is not the leaſt concern'd in that Parable, as the very *Jewiſh Prieſts* and *Scribes*, to whom it was ſpoken, will inform you. *Luke* 20. ℣. 19.

The whole Drift of the Parable was to forewarn the *Jews* of their approaching *Reprobation*, and Ruine: But particularly the *Prieſts* and *Scribes*, who came to *Chriſt* in the Temple to queſtion him concerning his *Authority* and *Doctrine*, ſaying to him, *by whoſe Authority doſt thou theſe Things? Or who is he, who gave thee this Authority?* Math. 21. ℣. 23. Luke 20. ℣. 2. Whereupon our Saviour propoſed the forementioned Parable, which contains a prediction of two Things. 1. That the *Jews* ſhould ſoon after treat him, as the *Husbandmen* in the Parable treated the *Heir* of the *Vineyard*. And 2. That they ſhould be punish'd by God, as the *Husbandmen* were punish'd by the *Lord* of the *Vineyard*. And the *Jewiſh Prieſts* and *Scribes* were ſo fully convinced, that they themſelves were the Perſons pointed at in the Parable, that (as St *Luke* tells us, ℣. 19.) *from that very Hour they ſought*

it

to lay Hands on Chriſt, for they perceived that he had ſpoken that Parable againſt them. And is not this now a wonderful Example to convince us, that all the Promiſes made to the *Chriſtian Church* are *conditional?* You may as well quote it for a Prediction of the *Fall* of the *Monument.* For it has full as much Connection with it.

There is indeed a Part added to the Application of the Parable made by *Chriſt* himſelf, which belongs to the *Chriſtian Church.* But it implies the very Reverſe of what you maintain. *Chriſt's* Words are theſe. *Therefore I ſay unto you, the Kingdom of God ſhall be taken from you, and given to a Nation bringing forth the Fruit thereof.* Math. 21. ℣. 43. Which Words plainly inſinuate this Difference between the *Synagogue*, and the *Church of Chriſt*; that whereas the *Kingdom of God* was to be taken from the former, *which did not bring forth the Fruits thereof*, it ſhould not be taken from the latter, *which would bring forth the Fruits thereof.* Whence it follows, that the *Church of Chriſt* will never imitate the *Apoſtacy* and Fall of the *Jewiſh Synagogue.* And, by Conſequence, the Promiſe of *Infallibility* made to her is *abſolute* and *Unconditional.* Becauſe no Condition of *Obedience* can be implied, when *Obedience* itſelf is a Part of the Promiſe; as it muſt certainly be to verify our Saviour's Words ſaying, that the *Nation* or *People*, to which the *Kingdom of God* was to be given, *ſhould bring forth the Fruit thereof.*

G. My Lord, As Treaſon forfeits an Eſtate or « Honours given by a Prince, tho in never ſo poſi- « tive Terms, and without any Condition expreſs'd, « but that of *Allegiance* to the Prince is always im- « plied; ſo the Church may forfeit her Charter. *pag.* « 28. 29. «

L. I anſwer *firſt*, that if a Prince could as infal-

libly foreſee the *unchangeable Allegiance* of his Subjects, as *Chriſt* foreſaw the *unalterable Faith* of his Church, when he promiſed, *that the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*, the Gifts and Favours of ſuch a Prince might be wholly *Unconditional*.

I anſwer *2dly*, that God's infinite Bounty is not to be meaſured by our ſhort Line. And therefore allowing it to be true, that a Prince cannot beſtow a Title or Honour, but that a *Condition* is implied, muſt this be a Law to the *Almighty*, and tie up his Hands from beſtowing an *Abſolute*, and *Unconditional* Favour?

» *G.* God ſaid to *Eli* the *high Prieſt* of the *Jewiſh* » Church, *I ſaid indeed that thy Houſe, and the Houſe* » *of thy Father ſhould walk before me for ever: But now* » *the Lord ſays, be it far from me. For them, that ho-* » *nour me, I will honour, and them that deſpiſe me, ſhall* » *be lightly eſteem'd.* 1. Sam. 2. ℣. 30. And he ſaid, » Num. 14. ℣. 34. *Ye ſhall know my Breach of Promiſe,* » or, as our Margin reads it, *the Altering of my Pur-* » *poſe.* And God has told us plainly, that we are » thus to underſtand his *Promiſes* as well as *Threat-* » *nings.* Jer. 18. ℣. 7. &c. *At what inſtant I ſhall* » *ſpeak concerning a Nation* (or Church) *to pluck up,* » *and to deſtroy it. If that Nation, againſt whom I have* » *pronounced, turn from their Evil, I will repent of the* » *Evil I thought to do unto them. And at what Inſtant* » *I ſhall ſpeak concerning a Nation* (or Church) *to* » *build and plant it, if it do evil in my Sight, that it* » *obey not my Voice, then will I repent of the Good,* » *wherewith I ſaid I would benefit them.*

» This was the Language of the Prophets to the » *Jewiſh Church*, but she underſtood it not, but » leant upon the Promiſes made to her as *uncondi-* » *tional* and *indefeaſible*, let her be as wicked as she » would. And this harden'd her againſt her Prophets,

whom she persecuted for this Reason as Enemies « to the Church; as we find, Jer. 18. ℣. 18. *Come,* « *and let us devise Devices against Jeremiah, for the Law* « *shall not perish from the Priest.* Here the *Jewish Church* « stuck; and here the *Church of Rome* sticks at this « Day. *pag.* 29. 30. «

L. Sr, as to the *Texts*, you have quoted, I shall let you know my Mind concerning them immediatly. But your Observations, particularly upon *Jeremy*, are somewhat extraordinary. For *first* you remark, *that this was the Language of the Prophets to the Jewish Church.* Tis true, the Prophet *Jeremy* spoke to the *Jews:* But their *Church* is not once mention'd in the whole Text: And what he threaten'd them with on the Part of God was the *Ruine* and *Desolation* of their *Country*, but not the *Fall* or *Apostacy* of their *Church*; which subsisted no less in their Captivity, than when they were in the most flourishing Condition. So that your joining the Word *Church* twice with the Text without having *Jeremy's* Leave for it, is making too bold with him.

2dly, you observe, *that the Jews understood not the Prophet's Language, but leant upon the Promises as unconditional and indefeasible.* And you add, *that this made them persecute Jeremy as an Enemy to the Church.* Now I cannot very well conceive how they could persecute *Jeremy* for a *Language*, which, as you tell me, *they understood not.* Tho in Reality the Text quoted by you is so plain, that the meanest Capacity may understand it; and I presume you think you understand it, for otherwise you would not have quoted it.

But I desire you to answer this *Dilemma.* Either the *Jews* understood the Prophet *Jeremy's* Language, or they understood it not. If not, they could not persecute him for it. But if they understood it, as

undoubtedly they did, they could not *lean upon God's Promiſes as unconditional and indefeaſible*; Since *Jeremy* taught them ſo plainly the contrary. Nay the ſad Experience of the many Calamities, that had befaln them both under their *Judges* and *Kings*, had ſufficiently taught them, that the Effect of the Promiſes, which God had made to proſper and protect them, depended on their *Obedience* to his Commands: and that therefore they could not lean on them as *unconditional* and *indefeaſible*.

G. But why then did they perſecute *Jeremy* Saying *Come let us deviſe Devices againſt Jeremy, for the Law ſhall not perish from the Prieſt?*

L. They perſecuted him, becauſe he told them ungrateful Truths, reproach'd them with their Crimes, and threaten'd them with God's Judgments, if they did not mend their Lives. This made them conſpire againſt him, and reſolve upon his Death. Becauſe (ſaid they) tho he ſhould perish, *the Law will not perish from the Prieſt*; and they hoped his Succeſſor would be leſs troubleſome to them.

G. However I perceive you grant, that God's Promiſes to the *Jews* were *Conditional*.

L. Sr, there are unconteſtable Inſtances of *Conditional* Promiſes in holy Writ. So Allowing the Texts, you have quoted, I ſhould be glad to know what Advantage you can make of them in Order to prove, that *all* God's Promiſes are *Conditional*. Is this a Good Conſequence, ſome Men are born blind, therefore all are born under that Misfortune? No ſurely. Yet your Conſequence is nothing better, when from a few Inſtances of *Conditional* Promiſes you conclude that all God's Promiſes are ſo. What do you think of God's Promiſe to *Noah*, that the World ſhall not perish by a *ſecond Deluge*? Or the great Promiſe of the *Meſſias*? I defy you with all

your Skill to tack the *Condition* of *Obedience* to either of them, or many others, which I omit for Brevity-ſake.

G. But are not all God's *Threats* Conditional?

L. They certainly are. Becauſe God is infinitly *Juſt*. And *Punishments* cannot be juſtly inflicted, unleſs they be firſt deſerved.

G. And why then are not all his *Promiſes* equally *Conditional?*

L. Becauſe he is infinitly *Bountiful*, and may beſtow his *Favours* whether they be deſerved, or not. That is, where, and in what Manner he pleaſes. So that, tho Promiſes may be charged with Conditions, their *Nature* or *Eſſence* requires no ſuch Thing.

G. The *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles* ſays to the *Gentile* Church, *thou ſhall't alſo be cut off, if thou continueſt not in the Goodneſs of God.* And that *the Jews, if they abide not ſtill in Unbelief, ſhall be graff'd in. For God is able to graff them in again.* Rom. 9. ℣. 22. 23. This ſhews, that the Promiſes made either to the *Jewiſh* or the *Gentile* Church are *Conditional*, viz. *if they continue in the Goodneſs of God.* Otherwiſe, ſays St *Paul*, to the *Gentile* Church, *thou ſhall't alſo be cut off.* And of all the *Gentile* Churches this was ſaid more particularly to the *Church of Rome.* For this is in the Epiſtle wrote to her, and to her it was ſaid, *thou ſhall't alſo be cut off.* pag. 30.

L. Surely now or never the *Church of Rome* muſt be *cut off*, and deſtroy'd *Root* and *Branch.* However I obſerve *firſt*, that when St *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, that Church was a mix'd Society of converted *Jews* and *Gentiles* brought into *one Fold.* So that your Calling them ſo often the *Gentile Church*, as if the *converted Gentiles* at *Rome* were a different Church from that of the *converted Jews*, is ſomewhat oddly expreſs'd.

I obſerve 2*dly*, (for you have taken Care to advertiſe me of it) that St *Paul's* Epiſtle to the *Romans* was particularly addreſs'd to the *Church of Rome* as diſtinguish'd from the other *Gentile Churches* (as you call them) which plainly marks out the *Dioceſs of Rome*, (that dearly beloved Equivocation, whereof you are ſo fond) and ſhews, that the *diffuſive Body* of the *Catholick Church*, whereof the *Dioceſs* of *Rome* is but a Part, is wholly out of the Reach of this Cutting Objection.

Suppoſe then that the *Church*, or *Dioceſs* of *Rome* ſhould be *cut off* (for I know of no Promiſes of *Infallibility* made to one *Dioceſs* more than another) or ſuppoſe the whole *Dioceſs* of *Rome* ſhould be ſwallow'd up by an Earthquake, would this deſtroy *Chriſt's Myſtical Body*, the *Church*? Or would she want a *Head*, tho there were no ſuch Town as *Rome*?

G. But why were thoſe Words, *thou ſhalt alſo be cut off, if thou continueſt not in the Goodneſs of God*, particularly addreſs'd to the *Church* of *Rome*?

L. Becauſe the whole Epiſtle was writ to the *Romans*, and the chief Motive of St *Paul's* Writing to them was, to put a Stop to the Diſputes, that were between the converted *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that dwell'd at *Rome*: each Party arrogating to itſelf an Advantage over the other. So that if thoſe Diſputes had happen'd amongſt Chriſtians at *Corinth*, or any other Town, the Apoſtle, whoſe zeal was not confined to any particular Place, would in all Probability have writ the ſame Epiſtle to them. And then your Argument would have made a moſt wretched Figure by being ſtript of the Equivocation, which is it's main Support.

I anſwer then directly, that as no *Promiſe* of *Infallibility* was ever made to any particular *Dioceſs* or *Nation*, but to the *Church in General*, ſo any parti-

alar *Dioceſs* or *Nation* may be *cut off* without involving
ne whole Church in that Apoſtacy, or being any
roof, that the Promiſes made to her are *Conditional.*

§. 24.

The Church always Viſible *and* Holy.

F. OF the *Church in General* it is ſaid *Luke* 18. « ℣. 8. *When the Son of Man cometh, ſhall he* « *nd Faith upon Earth?* Where will then that *Viſi-* « *ility* be, which *Rome* boaſts of as an Eſſential Mark « f the true Church? *pag.* 30. «

L. Juſt where it is at preſent, and where it has een in all Ages, *viz.* in the *Catholick Church* profeſs'd n the *Creed*, which will continue *Viſible* to the End f the World.

G. What, My Lord, do's not *Chriſt* here poſitively declare, that *when the Son of Man cometh, he ſhall ot find Faith upon Earth?*

L. No, Sr, he ſays no ſuch Thing. Nor could t *Auſtin*, who was a very clear-ſighted Perſon, ever liſcover this Meaning in the Words, you have uoted. For he anſwer'd that very Text of St *Luke* bjected by the *Donatiſts* againſt the Church's Infalibility: *firſt*, by Telling them, that thoſe Words, *hen the Son of Man cometh, ſhall he find Faith upon Earth?* Were to be underſtood of that *perfect Faith*, hich few attain to. L. de Unit. Eccl. C. 15. And St *erom* in his Dialogue againſt the *Luciferians* gives he very ſame Anſwer to it. But St *Auſtin* adds a ſeond in the Place quoted. His Words are theſe. *Or lſe we underſtand them of that great Number of Wicked, nd Scarcity of good Men, concerning which enough has lready been ſaid. And therefore our Lord expreſſes himelf under a doubt* (pray, Sr, mind what follows)

for he ſays not, when the Son of Man cometh, he will not find Faith upon Earth, but, do you think he will find Faith upon Earth? To which he adds, that our Saviour ſaid not this to expreſs any Doubt of his own, but *becauſe the many Scandals, which will ariſe towards the End of the World, will occaſion human Weakneß to ſpeak in that Manner.*

Here then it is plain, that St *Auſtin* did not underſtand, as you do, our Saviours *doubtful Interrogation* to be equivalent to this *poſitive Affirmation*, viz. that *at his ſecond Coming he ſhall not find Faith upon Earth*, So in his Epiſtle to the *Donatiſt Vincentius* he tells him thoſe Words of Chriſt were ſpoken *propter Abundantiam iniquitatis*, to expreſs the Abundance of Iniquity. And his following Words are remarkable. *It is a Truth* (ſays he) *not to be queſtion'd, that they, whoſe Faith Chriſt will find upon Earth, will grow with the Tares all the Field over.* Epiſt. 93. *olim.* 48. *ad Vincentium.* Beſides the Church of Chriſt is compared to a *City ſet upon a Hill*, And I preſume a City on a Hill is a *viſible* Thing.

» *G.* She is likewiſe compared to a *Women perſe-* » *cuted into a Wilderneß*, Rev. 12. ℣. 16. pag. 31.

L. I anſwer *firſt*, it is more than either you or I can tell, whether the *Church* be meant by that *Woman:* or what is meant by her being *perſecuted into a Wilderneß.* All Explications upon it are but Gueſſes: and Gueſſes are but a weak Foundation to build an Argument upon.

I anſwer 2. that the *Iſraelits* were perſecuted into the Wilderneſs by *Pharao*, yet I never read they were therefore become *Inviſible.* Nor do I think a *Church* becomes *inviſible* by being perſecuted.

» *G.* She is alſo compared to a *Lodge in a Gar-* » *den of Cucumbers*, and to a *beſieged City.* Iſa. 1. ℣. 8. » pag. 31.

L. Sir,

L. Sr, if you will give yourſelf the Trouble to read the Text, you will find it is not the *Chriſtian Church*, but the Deſolation of *Juda* and *Jeruſalem*, which is ſpoken of by *Iſaiah*.

G. Laſtly, at the *Coming* of *Chriſt* she will be « ſo little Viſible, that *Faith* will hardly be found « upon Earth. This is not to be reconciled but of « different States of the Church, and at different « Times. *pag.* 31. «

L. What you now ſay, Sr, is but a Repetition of your former Miſtake, which St *Auſtin* has already anſwer'd for me. But in whatever State the Church is, or ever will be in the World, that is whether in *Perſecution* or *Peace*, she can never loſe her *Viſibility*, but will always have her Marks to diſtinguish her from all *Heretical* and *Schiſmatical* Communions. Nay she will not only be always *Viſible*, but always *Holy*, as we profeſs in the *Creed*. That is, free from Errors. And this is alſo taught by St *Paul* ſaying, *that Chriſt loved his Church, and gave himſelf for it, that it should be Holy, and without Blemish.* Epheſ. 5. ℣. 27.

G. So God call'd the *Church* of the *Jews*, *the dear* « *beloved of his Soul.* Jer. 12. ℣. 7. Yet ſays he had « forſaken her for her Wickedneſs, and *hated* her. « And *Iſaiah* repreſents her as moſt *filthy* and *corrup-* « *ted.* 1. ℣. 4. 5. 6. pag. 31. «

L. Really, Sr, one would be apt to conclude from your Diſcourſe, that the *Church of Chriſt* has no Advantage over the *Synagogue*. Did God ever promiſe the *Jewish Synagogue*, as *Chriſt* has promiſed his Church, *that he would be with her to the End of the World?* And if God never made her any ſuch Promiſe, but foreſaw that she would apoſtatize, is it a Wonder he forſook her for her Wickedneſs, and *hated* her, who before had been his *Dear-beloved?* Or

can you conclude from thence, that the ſame will happen to the *Church* of *Chriſt*, to which he has promiſed his *perpetual Aſſiſtance?* Pray, Sr, what means this Article of the *Creed*, *I believe the Holy Catholick Church?* I preſume it means that *Chriſt* has a Church upon Earth, which is *Catholick* and *Holy*. If then *Chriſt's* Church should ever ceaſe to be *Holy*, that Article of the *Creed* would be falſe.

» *G.* My Lord, the Church is call'd *Holy* and *be-*
» *loved* becauſe of God's Covenant with her to be
» *Holy* and *beloved*. Which will be hereafter in thoſe
» that are *perfected:* when the *Tares* and the *Wheat*
» shall be ſeparated: But they muſt grow together
» till then, *when Chriſt shall gather out of his Kingdom*
» *all Things that offend, and them, which do Iniquity,*
» Math. 13. ℣. 41. But he has not yet ſo *perfected* it.
» That Time is not come. She is ſtill in her *cleanſ-*
» *ing* State, but not yet throughly *cleanſed*. And
» the Scripture ſpeaks of both theſe States of the
» Church. But when we diſtinguish not, and would
» apply to the moſt *corrupt State*, what is ſaid of the
» moſt *Glorious*, we muſt needs fall into many Er-
» rors and Miſtakes. *pag.* 31. 32.

L. That's certain. And therefore to prevent my Falling into any ſuch Error or Miſtake, I will diſtinguish between the *two States* of the Church. That is, the Church *Militant* and *Triumphant*, and attribute to each, what properly belongs to it.

'Tis therefore an undoubted Truth that the Words of St *Paul* to the *Epheſians* cannot be underſtood *abſolutely*, and in their *full Extent* but of the Church *Triumphant*, according to St *Auſtin's* Doctrine. And the Reaſon is clear becauſe no one *entire Society* but that of the *Bleſſed above* can pretend to a *Holineſs* excluding *all Spot or Wrinkle, or any ſuch Thing.*

But muſt we therefore conclude, that St *Paul's*

Words may not likewiſe be underſtood of the *Church Militant* in a more limited Senſe? If ſo, we muſt make he *Creed* ſpeak abſurdly in Calling her *the Holy Catholick Church*: which is undoubtedly to be underood of *Chriſt's Church* upon Earth. *Firſt* then she is ll'd *Holy*, or *without Spot or Wrinkle* in her *Faith*, hich admits of no Sorts of Errors againſt the *real'd Word* of *God*. 2. She is *Holy* in her *Sacraments*. d *Morals*. 3. She is *Holy*, and *without Spot or Wrin-* in all her Children, whilſt they preſerve their *ptiſmal Grace* entire and undefiled. And 4. she is *oly* in the ſame Senſe, as she is call'd the *Communon of Saints*. Which is not underſtood ſo, as if all her Communion were *Saints*, but becauſe *Many* e, and *all* may be *Saints* in her Communion, and ere can be none out of it.

G. My Lord, the Difficulty, under which the « *urch of Rome* now labours is this. She firſt makes « rſelf the *Catholick Church*----- «

L. That is to ſay, Sr, *Chriſt* has made her ſo, as have already shew'd.

G. And then Applying to herſelf in this her « *rupt* State, whatever is ſaid of the *Church* even « her *Perfect*, *Glorious*, and *Triumphant* State, « eates her infinite Trouble, and endleſs Diſtinc- « ons to reconcile theſe; which is as impoſſible to « done, as to make the *Church* in *Heaven* and « on *Earth* to be the ſame. *pag.* 32. «

L. Sr, the *Creed* ſpeaks of the *Church* upon *Earth*, d tells us she is *Holy*. And I hope we do not err believing the *Creed*. But you blamed us juſt now r not Diſtinguishing, and now again you tax us th endleſs Diſtinctions. So whether we blow *Hot Cold*, I find we muſt be in the Wrong. But I have errupted you, ſo pray go on.

G. My Lord, whilſt the *Corruptions* of the *Church* «

» of *Rome* are confeſs'd and lamented by the moſt
» learned, and the moſt pious in her Communion;
» she may as well maintain her *Impeccability* as *In-*
» *fallibility*. For *Sin* is the greateſt *Error*. And there-
» fore I think nothing can be *infallible*, but what is
» likewiſe *impeccable*. pag. 32.

L. Sr, you tell me with a very ſerious Countenance, *that the Corruptions of the Church of Rome are confeſs'd and lamented by the moſt learned and moſt pious in her Communion*. But pray, Sr, name me one *Catholick Divine*, who ever own'd any *Corruptions* in the *Doctrine* of the *Church of Rome*. And if you mean Corruptions of particular Perſons in *Practice*, what you ſay, is nothing to the Purpoſe. *He who is free from Sin, let him throw the firſt Stone*: for I am ſure no Body will be in Danger of being hurt by it.

But nothing forſooth can be *infallible*, but what is likewiſe *impeccable*. That's very ſtrange. For cannot God preſerve a Man from Errors in *Faith*, tho at the ſame Time he permits him to fall into *Sin*? Now *Chriſt* has promiſed the *former*, but not the *latter* to his *Church*, and therefore the one may be maintain'd without the other.

You ſay *that Sin is the greateſt Error*. But I preſume every Sin is not an Error againſt *Faith*: and if it be not, the Church's *Infallibility* cannot be hurt by it. I am therefore ſurpriz'd at what you add, viz. *that nothing can be infallible, but what is likewiſe impeccable*. Pray, Sr, were not the *Apoſtles infallible*?

» *G.* No more *infallible* than *impeccable*. St *Peter*
» *err'd, and walk'd not uprightly according to the Truth*
» *of the Goſpel, and many were carried away with his*
» *Diſſimulation*. Gal. 2. ℣. 13. 14. pag. 32.

L. What, Sr! Were not the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts infallible* in their *Doctrine*, and *Writings*! If not, then we are not ſure, that the *New Teſtament* con-

tains nothing but the *reveal'd Word* of *God*. And what becomes then of *Christianity?* As to St *Peter*, tho he was *reprehensible* (as St *Paul* says) in his *Practice*, no Christian will surely say, he err'd in *Faith*.

G. St *Paul* own'd, that in some Cases *he had no* « *Commandement of the Lord*, only gave his Judgment « as a private Person, and spoke *by Permission*, *and* « *not of Commandement*. But in other Cases he said, « *I command, yet not I, but the Lord* ---- And, *it is so* « *after my Judgment, and I think also, that I have the* « *Spirit of the Lord*. 1. Cor. 7. ℣. 6. And no Doubt « great Deference was paid to his Judgment, as « being an *inspired* Man, but not *infallible* in every « Thing, as himself said. The *Apostles* were enabled « to work many and great *Miracles*, which gave them « full Credence as to what they deliver'd for *Christian* « *Doctrine*. But this was no personal, nor universal « *Infallibility*. p. 32. 33. «

L. Sr, I have hitherto believed that *all Scripture is given by divine Inspiration*. 2. Tim. 3. ℣. 16. And by, Consequence that the *sacred Penmen*, whether they deliver'd *Precepts* or *Counsels*, were equally *inspired*: that is, to deliver *Precepts* for *Precepts*, and *Counsels* for *Counsels*. But I perceive it is your Judgment, that when St *Paul* to the *Corinthians* gave his Advice concerning *Celibacy*, he wrote not by *Inspiration*, nor was *infallible* in his Doctrine; which in Effect is the Contradictory to what he tells us, *that all Scripture is given by Divine Inspiration*. 2. Tim. 3. ℣. 16.

I shall therefore put this Dilemma to you. *viz.* When St *Paul* wrote to the *Corinthians* the Words you have quoted, either he was *inspired* to write so, or not. If he was, your Quotations from him do no ways prove, that he was not *infallible* in all his Doctrine. If not, that Part of his Epistle was not *inspired*. And by Consequence 'tis false *that*

all Scripture is given by the Inſpiration of God.

As to what you ſay, *that the Apoſtles were enabled to work many and great Miracles.* This, to the beſt of my Judgment is ſome Proof of the *Infallibility* of their Doctrine. For our Diſpute is not concerning their *Infallibility* in Things, that have no Relation to the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, as *Philoſophy*, *Mathematicks*, or other humane Sciences. Neither do's the Church pretend to *Infallibility* but in Defining Articles of *Faith*, and *Chriſtian Morality*. And she can ſhew her *Credentials* for it, *viz.* the Teſtimony of *Miracles*, as the *Apoſtles* did. For *Miracles* are God's own *Seal*, by which he makes himſelf a Witneſs to the Truth of his Doctrine.

§. 25.

Of Miracles.

» *G.* WHat! Both *true* and *falſe!* Can both be » from God? Or can you deny the many » *falſe Miracles*, which have been notoriouſly de- » tected in the *Church of Rome?* pag. 33.

L. I aſſure you, Sr, that whoever will be ſo kind as to detect any *falſe Miracle* in the *Church of Rome*, will be heartily thank'd for his Pains; And the Author of the Cheat be puniſh'd according to his Deſerts.

» *G.* If but one *Sham-miracle* had been found in » the *Apoſtles*, I am afraid it had diſcredited all the » others, and call'd their *Miſſion* in Queſtion, whe- » ther it was from God, or not. *pag.* 33.

L. I am of your Mind, Sr: And yet there were *Sham-miracles* told of the *Apoſtles* themſelves: but being not countenanced by them, they did not in the leaſt diſcredit their real Miracles. And if you can

nd one *Sham-miracle* countenanced by the Autho-ity of the *Church of Rome*, you may diſcredit her as uch as you pleaſe.

G. The Devil has Power (when permitted) to « hew great *Signs* and *Wonders*. Math. 24. and 2. « Theſ. 2. ℣. 3. and the Reaſon is given ℣. 12. viz. *as* « *a juſt Punishment of Unrighteouſneſs*. pag. 33. «

L. But I hope the *Devil's* Power to shew *Signs* and *Wonders* is no Proof, that God has no Power to work *Miracles* by his *Saints*. And pray remember who they were, that attributed *Chriſt's* Miracles to *Beelzebub* the *Prince* of the *Devils*. Which was ſo black a Crime, that our Saviour calls it *Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, which would neither be forgiven them in this World, nor in the World to come*. Math. 12. ℣. 32.

G. My Lord, one *falſe*, or *pretended Miracle* is « ſufficient to diſprove all that come from the ſame « Hand. Therefore your Book of Miracles the *Le-* « *gends* muſt either be all believed, or all rejected, « all coming from the ſame Authority: And the « greateſt Part of them are ſo very groſs and ſimple, « that no Man of Senſe among you will ſay, that « he can believe Half of them. And your learned « all them *pia fraudes*, holy Cheats to ſtir up the « Devotion of the Vulgar, who swallow all *implicitly*. « And your *Lordship* will have Difficulty enough to « believe all the Miracles alledg'd of their *Reliques*. « And, as I ſaid, you muſt take *all* or *none:* unleſs « you think, that *God* can work *true Miracles*, and « the *Devil falſe ones* by the ſame Means, and at the « ſame Time. *pag.* 33. 34. «

L. Before I anſwer this wretched Stuff Word for Word, I shall lay down ſome Principles, whereof you ſeem to be wholly ignorant. For really, Sr, you oblige me ſometimes to deal with you, as if I were inſtructing a young Schollar.

First then, the *Church of Rome* do's not oblige us to believe any Miracles but thoſe, that are related in *Scripture*. The reſt, tho never ſo well atteſted, may be believed or rejected, and the Belief of them was never made a Condition of Communion. So that, whether many of theſe be true or not, 'tis but meer Trifling to draw any Conſequence from it in a Diſpute about Matters of *Faith*.

2*dly*, I grant, that a Perſon convicted of a *forged Miracle*, or one wrought by the Power of *Art-magick*, can never be reputed a Worker of *true Miracles*.

3*dly*. *Falſe Miracles* may be reported of a Perſon, that works *true ones*, as it happen'd to the *Apoſtles* themſelves. Whence it follows, that as *fabulous Relations*, or *Romances* do not take off from the Credit of *Authentick Hiſtories*, ſo the *Legendary Miracles* related by ſome Authors do not ſink the Credit of all *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*.

4*thly*. The very beſt Hiſtorian may be miſtaken in ſome Facts. Yet this is no Argument or Proof that he is to be believed in nothing. Sr *Richard Baker* has told many Untruths: yet I ſhould be a *Madman* to think, he has writ nothing but *Fables*.

Theſe Principles being ſuppoſed, I ſhall anſwer you Word for Word: Firſt you ſay, *that one falſe or pretended Miracle is ſufficient to diſprove all, that come from the ſame Hand*. This is true in the Senſe of the ſecond Principle, I have laid down. viz. *that a Perſon convicted of a forged Miracle, or one wrought by the Power of Art-magick, can never be reputed a Worker of true Miracles*. But if you mean that an Hiſtorian, who by *Miſtake*, or an *Over-credulity* relates one *falſe Miracle*, cannot relate any *true ones*, tis not only falſe, but ridiculous. So is what follows next, viz. *Therefore our Books of Miracles the Legends muſt either*

ither be all believed, or all rejected, all coming from the ame Authority. As if it were impoſſible, a Man hould ever ſpeak Truth, becauſe he is ſometimes niſtaken.

G. But how then muſt we diſtinguish *true Miracles* from falſe or ſuſpected ones?

L. By the very ſame Method as we diſtinguish *true Facts* from *Miſtakes* in other Hiſtories.

You go on thus. *And the greateſt Part of them are ſo very Groſs and ſimple, that no Man of Senſe among us will ſay, that we can believe Half of them.* Sr, I have only your Word for it; *that the greateſt Part of them are Groſs and ſimple*, and your Word is no Proof. However I am obliged to you for Allowing, that there are *ſome Men of Senſe* amongſt us; And, if that will pleaſe you, I freely own, there are alſo *Fools* in our Church as well as yours. But, in the Buſineſs of Salvation, I would hazard myſelf on the *Fool's* Side rather than the *Knave's*. For to be miſtaken in a frivolous Matter is no Sin; But to ſeduce others by crafty and malicious Inſinuations is a very grievous one: and this you are guilty of in the following Words. viz. *That our learned Men call falſe Miracles*, piæ fraudes, *holy Cheats, to ſtir up the Devotion of the Vulgar*, who *ſwallow all implicitly.* For this imports no leſs, than that our learned Men wilfully impoſe ſuch Cheats upon the People: which is both falſe and malicious.

You tell me next, *that I ſhall have Difficulty enough to believe all the Miracles alledg'd of the Reliques of Saints.* And I tell you, Sr, that I am neither *Fool* enough to believe all, nor *impudent* enough to deny *all.* And therefore what you add, *that I muſt take all or none*, is the ſame as to tell me, I muſt either be a *Fool*, or have a Face of Braſs. When I read or hear of a Miracle not well atteſted, I ſuſpend my Judgment,

But when St *Auſtin* or a Man of his Character tells me, that he ſaw with his own Eyes Miracles wrought by the *Reliques* of ſuch or ſuch a *Saint*, or related them from unqueſtionable Authority, I confeſs I want ſome Grains of *true Proteſtant Aſſurance* to give him the Lie.

What you conclude with is to me a perfect Riddle. viz. *That I muſt take all or none. Unleſs I think that God can work true Miracles, and the Devil falſe ones by the ſame Means, and at the ſame Time.* For in the Name of Nonſenſe cannot I believe *ſome* Miracles, and deny *others* without Yoaking *God* and the *Devil* together to work both true and falſe Miracles by the ſame Means, and at the ſame Time! This is ſuch a Piece of undigeſted Raving, that I really ſuſpect you are talking in your Sleep. But let us hear out the reſt of your Dream.

» *G.* Can you believe the Quantities, that have » been ſhewn of the *Virgin's Milk* at ſeveral Times » and Places? And ſo of the *Wood* of the *Croſs*, that » is ſhew'd in many Places? *pag.* 34.

L. Really, Sr, one would be apt to conclude from your Way of Expreſſing yourſelf, that *whole Pails* of our Lady's Milk, and whole *Cart-loads* of the Wood of the Croſs are to be ſeen in our Churches. I confeſs, I have ſeen ſeveral *Particles* of the *holy Croſs* well atteſted. But as to the holy *Virgin's Milk*, till I find at leaſt ſome Drops of it either in Pope *Pius's Profeſſion of Faith*, or in ſome of the *Creeds*, I ſhall not be much concern'd about the Matter.

» *G.* Is it the ſame *Head*, or *Body* of the ſame » *Saint*, that is ſhewn at different Churches, each of » which contend that they have the true one? And » each have *Miracles* to vouch the Truth of their » *Relique.* pag. 34.

L. No, Sr, it is not the ſame Head, nor the Body

of the ſame Saint, that is ſhewn at different Churches. But they may be the Heads and Bodies of two different Saints bearing the ſame Name. And if God has wrought Miracles by them both, pray where is the Ridicule of it? Miracles are only Teſtimonies that they are truly the *Reliques* of ſome *Saint*: but they never were pretended to be a Proof, that they are the Reliques of *this* or *that* particular Saint. And if the Owners of them maintain, what they think probably true, will their Miſtake derogate from the Truth of the Miracles, which God works by them? Have you any more to ſay?

G. You may ſee a large Collection of your Miracles, and the Monſtrouſneſs of the Legends, out of which they are taken, in a Book entitled, *the Devotions of the Roman Church*, which will prevent my giving Inſtances in all the Points before mention'd. *pag.* 34.

L. And, Sr, to prevent my giving Inſtances of the Falſehoods and Miſrepreſentations contain'd in that infamous *Libel*, you may ſee it anſwer'd in the *Appendix* of *the true Church of Chriſt ſhew'd*, *&c.* pag. 476. 477. &c.

G. Upon the whole, this *Pretence* of *Miracles*, the *Legends*, and *Shops of Reliques*, which are bought and Sold, inſtead of a Proof, are the greateſt Prejudice to Men of Senſe againſt your Church. And it is the *ſoreſt Blow*, that *Chriſtianity* has received: While the common People put theſe *Legends* upon the Level with the holy *Scriptures*, as having both the ſame Foundation, that is, *the Authority of the Church*. Whence *Atheiſts* and *Deiſts* take a handle to render both alike fabulous. *pag.* 34. 35.

L. Sr, if *Atheiſm* and *Deiſm* were the Fruits of *Popery*, they would have had the Space of nine hundred Years before the *Reformation* to grow, and ripen

in this Nation. But *England* was a Stranger both to profeſs'd *Atheiſts* and *Deiſts* before the Change of Religion: and thoſe unclean Beaſts had never enter'd into the Land, if the *Fences* of the *Church* had been kept up. But when thoſe were broke down by the bleſſed *Reformation*; When the Church's Authority was render'd precarious, and the *Scriptures* ſubjected to the Caprice of every private Judgment, 'twas then that *Deiſts* and *Atheiſts* began to appear bare-faced, and *Chriſtianity* received the *ſore Blow*, you ſpeak of.

But with what Face can you call the unanimous Teſtimony of the Ancient Fathers a *Pretence of Miracles?* Have you the Confidence to tax St *Athanaſius*, St *Baſil*, St *Gregory Nazianzene*, St *Jerom*, St *Ambroſe*, St *Auſtin*, and other ſuch eminent Perſons, either with *Forgery* in Relating, or *Weakneſs* in Believing the Miracles atteſted in their Writings? What do you think of St *Gregory* ſirnamed *Thaumaturgus*, or *Worker of Miracles*, of whom St *Baſil* (*L. de Spiritu Sancto* C. 29.) gives this Account, *that he made the Devils tremble -- Rivers change their Courſe, and by his Prayers dried up a Pool, which was an Occaſion of Quarrels between two avaricious Brothers?* So that the very Enemies of Religion call'd him a ſecond *Moſes*.

What do you think of St *Auſtin*, who (L. 22. de Civ. Dei C. 8, and in his Sermons) relates above 70. Miracles wrought in his Dioceſs, when he was Biſhop of it, at the *Reliques* of St *Stephen* in leſs than two Years Time? And aſſures us, that there happen'd more at the *Reliques* of the ſame Saint in other Parts of *Africa*. Of this kind he mentions *Lucillus*, a Biſhop near *Hippo* cured miraculouſly of a Fiſtula. And of a blind Woman, who recover'd her Sight, by Putting Flowers, which had touch'd the *Reliques*,

o her Eyes. Of thoſe done in his own Dioceſs he elates three Perſons raiſed to Life.

The ſame Saint, and St *Ambroſe* inform us of many other Miracles wrought at the *Reliques* of the holy Martyrs *Gervaſius* and *Protaſius* at *Milan* An. 386. As of a Blindman call'd *Severus*, who approaching to the *Reliques* was before all the People preſently reſtored to Sight: Saint *Ambroſe* alſo being preſent. *Amb. Epiſt.* 54. *in Edit. Bened. Epiſt.* 22.

Miracles done at the Tomb, and by the Interceſſion of St *Felix*, Prieſt of *Nola* are atteſted by St *Paulinus* Carm. 16. 21. 22. and by St *Auſtin*, Epiſt. 137. and *L. de Cura pro mortuis.* C. 16. As others at the *Reliques* of St *Andrew*, St *Luke*, and St *Timothy* are alſo atteſted by St *Jerom* Libro *contra Vigilantium*, and by St *Gregory* of *Nazianzene* Orat. 3. *quæ eſt prima contra Julianum.*

'Tis true, theſe and the like Miracles are only Objects of *humane Faith.* But are they therefore falſe? The Authority of St *Ambroſe*, St *Auſtin*, St *Jerom*, &c. is not equal to that of the 4 *Evangeliſts:* But are they therefore *Impoſtors?* Or did thoſe Saints encourage *Deiſm* and *Atheiſm*, by relating and believing the aforeſaid Miracles?

As to what you ſay concerning our *Shops of Reliques*, which you tell me are *bought* and *ſold*, if Calumny be a deadly Sin, you are guilty of one. For our Church deteſts ſuch infamous Practices, and *Simony* is a Crime ſeverely punish'd by her.

But what you add is a Calumny yet of a blacker Die, viz. *that the common People put the Legends upon the Level with the holy Scriptures, as having both the ſame Foundation, that is, the Authority of the Church.* Pray, Sr, how ſhould the common People come to take up ſuch a ſacrilegious Notion! Do's our *Church* teach them any ſuch Thing? Can you find this abo-

minable Doctrine either in our *Catechiſms*, *Sermons*, or *ſpiritual Books*, which are in the Hands of every Body, and are the only Means, by which our Doctrine is convey'd to Perſons of all Degrees? Or can you produce one ſingle *Divine* of our Church, that ever taught it? If this then be a Task you dare not undertake, if you be conſcious to yourſelf, that you cannot produce any ſolid Proof of what you charge us with, then, Sr, give me leave to tell you, you are in a damnable State, till you retract the Calumny, you have utter'd againſt us. And believe me, Sr, *there is nothing can give Men of Senſe a greater Prejudice againſt your Church*, than when they find, that even her ableſt Divines are forced to ſupport themſelves by barefaced Calumnies to ſtand their Ground againſt us.

To conclude this whole Matter, I tell you once more that the *Authority of our Church* is not at all concern'd in the *Legends*, or *Lives* of *Saints*. For they have no other Authority, than that of the Perſons, who atteſt or relate them: Nor any other Foundation, than what other Hiſtories have. But we believe the *Scriptures* to be the pure *reveal'd Word of God:* And our belief of it is truly grounded upon the *Authority* of the *Church*.

§. 26.

The Circle *examined.*

» *G.* THis is the *Old Circle*, out of which you can » never conjure yourſelves. *pag.* 35.

L. Or rather, Sr, this is the Old thread-bare Argument, which has been anſwer'd a thouſand Times, and is ſtill repeated with the ſame triumphant Air, as if no Anſwer had ever been given to it.

G. You believe the *Scriptures*, becauſe the *Church* « bids you ---- «

L. And ſo did St *Auſtin*, when he ſaid, *he would not believe the Goſpels themſelves, unleſs the Authority of the Church induced him to it.* Con. Epiſt. Fund. C. 4.

G. And you believe the *Church*, becauſe the « *Scriptures* bid you. *pag.* 35. «

L. Well! And when the *Scriptures* bid St *Auſtin* believe the *Church*, do you think he refuſed to do it?

G. This is Running round, and Proving a Thing « by itſelf. *pag.* 35. «

L. It ſeems then poor St *Auſtin* was neither *Logician* nor *Divine*; but danced round in a *vicious Circle.* However I am reſolved to keep the good old Biſhop Company, being wholly of his Opinion, that the *Authority* of the *Church* is a ſolid Foundation to ground our Belief of the *Canon* and *Inſpiration* of *Scriptures* upon; and likewiſe fully convinced, that in all Matters of *Faith* we muſt take the *Church* for our *Guide*, ſince our own *Reaſon* is too deceitful a Thing to truſt to.

G. And how do you know that? What have « you but your own Reaſon to tell you ſo? And if « you cannot truſt your *Reaſon*, you cannot believe « the *Church.* So that all Bottoms upon your own « *Reaſon* ſtill, from which you ſtrive in vain to eſ- « cape. *pag.* 35. «

L. To anſwer this pretty Piece of Sophiſtry, ſuppoſe, Sr, you had a *Lawſuit* to commence, what would your *Reaſon* prompt you to do?

G. My Reaſon would prompt me to chuſe ſome able *Lawyer*, and depend upon him.

L. But why would you not rather manage your Cauſe yourſelf?

G. Becauſe my own *Reaſon* is too weak to truſt to in the Management of a *Law-ſuit*, and an able

Lawyer alone is duely qualified for it.

L. And how do you know that? What have you but your own Reaſon to tell you ſo? And if you cannot truſt your Reaſon, you cannot truſt your Lawyer.

Is not this fine Stuff? Is it not Arguing like a profound Divine? I anſwer therefore, that as your own *Reaſon* may be truſted, when it directs you to an able *Lawyer*, and as the ſame Reaſon tells you, that when you have choſen one, you muſt be govern'd by him, ſo I can ſafely truſt my own *Reaſon*, when it directs me to the *Church* to be my *Guide* to Salvation. Becauſe nothing is more conſonant to *Reaſon*, than to depend upon a Guide appointed by God himſelf.

Thus far therefore *Reaſon* is to be follow'd. But when we have once found the *true Church of Chriſt*, which the ſtrongeſt *Motives* of *Credibility* mark out to our *Reaſon* aſſiſted by God's Grace, then we have nothing elſe to do but to ſubmit to her, and be govern'd by her in every Thing she teaches. So that if this be your Meaning, when you conclude, *that all bottoms upon Reaſon*, I ſubſcribe to it without Heſitation. Nor ſhall I ever *ſtrive to eſcape from my Reaſon*, when it demands ſo juſt and reaſonable a Thing of me, as an Entire Submiſſion and Obedience to the Judgment and Authority of the *Church*. Nay the *Scriptures* themſelves command me to hear the Church. *He who will not hear the Church, let him be reputed as a Heathen and a Publican.* Math. 18. ℣. 17.

» *G.* This is Running into the *Circle* again to be» lieve the *Church* for the *Scriptures*, and the *Scrip*» *tures* for the *Church*. pag. 35. 36.

L. What, Sr! Would you neither have me believe the *Church* upon the Teſtimony of *Scriptures*, nor the *Scriptures* upon the Teſtimony of the *Church*? I ſhould not wonder, if a *Deiſt* preach'd this Doctrine to me. However I muſt obſerve to you, that

if

if the Word *believe* be *ſtrictly* taken, that is, for an Act of *Divine Faith* grounded upon it's *proper Motive*, I neither believe the *Scriptures*, becauſe the *Church* bids me, nor the *Church*, becauſe the *Scriptures* bid me. And ſo my *Faith* is in no Danger of running round in a *Circle*.

G. Upon what *Motives* then do you believe the *Revelation* of *Scriptures*, or the *Infallibility* of the *Church*?

L. Preciſely, becauſe *God has reveal'd thoſe Truths*. And this is the whole and ſole *eſſential Motive*, into which all *Faith* ſtrictly taken is reſolved.

G. But how do you know that God has reveal'd thoſe Truths?

L. Becauſe the *Church of Chriſt*, which is a Society of the greateſt *Wiſdom* and *Authority* upon Earth, tells me ſo. And, if St *Auſtin* may be credited, 'tis nothing leſs than the *moſt inſolent Madneſs*, not to believe her.

G. But what inducement have you to convince you that the Church, whereof you are a Member, is the *Church of Chriſt* rather than any other *ſeparate Society*?

L. I am convinced of it by the ſame *outward viſible Marks*, or *Motives* of *Credibility*, which held St *Auſtin* within the Pales of the Church, whereof he was a Member, and which ſhe would have had, altho the *Scriptures* had never been written. As, *the continual Succeſſion of her Biſhops, and Paſtors from the Apoſtles. Her having had innumerable Martyrs and Miracles in her Communion. The Agreement of People and Nations*, &c. reckon'd up by St *Auſtin*. cont. Epiſt. fund. C. 4.

G. But do you not prove the *Canon* and *Revelation* of *Scriptures* from the *Authority* of the *Church*? And then again the *infallible Authority* of the Church from *Scriptures*?

L. We do ſo.

G. And is not this running round in a *Circle?*

L. It is ſo, but not in a *vicious* one, as *Logicians* call it. On the contrary, theſe *circular* Proofs are allow'd of by all *Logicians* and *Divines.* Nay they are abſolutely neceſſary, both when *Cauſes* and *Effects* prove one another reciprocally, and when two Perſons of *unqueſtionable Veracity* give Teſtimony for each other. I ſhall only give an Inſtance of the latter.

St *John* the *Baptiſt* is proved to have been a *Prophet* from the Teſtimony of *Chriſt*; And *Chriſt* is proved to be the *Meſſias* from the Teſtimony of St *John.* No Chriſtian can reject theſe Proofs as illegal. And why then may not the *Scriptures* be proved from the Teſtimony of the *Church*, and the *Church* reciprocally from the Teſtimony of *Scriptures?* Both Proofs indeed are *circular:* and therefore as the former muſt be unqueſtionably admitted, the latter cannot be reaſonably excepted againſt.

G. Such, My Lord, as knew *Chriſt* before they knew St *John*, might upon *Chriſt's Word* believe St *John.* And ſuch as firſt knew St *John* to be a *Prophet* before they knew *Chriſt*, might upon St *John's* Word believe *Chriſt.*

L. I thank you, Sr, for this good Hint. 'Tis the beſt Thing you have ſaid this long Time: But it opens the *Old Circle* for me, and puts me out of all Danger of being hemm'd in. Firſt then I know the *Church* of *Chriſt* by her *outward viſible Marks*, or *Motives* of *Credibility*, which are ſo ſtrong and convincing, that according to St *Auſtin*, I muſt be a Madman not to believe her. This Church tells me, for Example, *that the whole New Teſtament is divinely inſpired.* I therefore believe upon her Teſtimony, that the New Teſtament contain's nothing but *revealed*

uths. Now amongſt other Truths contain'd in it I
ıd *Chriſt's* poſitive Promiſe, *that the Gates of Hell*
all not prevail againſt his Church. Math. 16. ℣. 18.
nother Promiſe, *that he will be with her even unto*
e End of the World. Math. 28. ℣. 19. I likewiſe find
ı St *Paul*, that *the Church is the Pillar and Ground of*
ruth. 1. Tim. 3. ℣. 15. Upon theſe and ſuch like
eſtimonies of holy *Scriptures* I believe it to be a
veal'd Truth, that the *Church* is *infallible.* And thus
e *Church* firſt gives Teſtimony for *Scriptures*, and
en the *Scriptures* give Teſtimony for the *Church.*
ıd ſhew me now a Difference, if you can, be-
een this *Circle*, and that of proving St *John* to be a
ophet from the Teſtimony of *Chriſt*, and proving
ciprocally *Chriſt* to be the *Meſſias* from the Teſti-
ɔny of St *John.*

G. But what then is a *vicious Circle?*

L. A *vicious Circle* is, when two Propoſitions are
de Uſe of to infer one another without having
ſ other Proof to ſupport them. But if they be
ɔved from other ſtrong and convincing Reaſons,
s *opens* the *Circle*, and hinders it from being what
call a *vicious* one. Now this is the very Caſe in
ference to the *Church's Infallibility*, and the *Autho-*
of Scriptures. The *Church of Chriſt* as ſuch is firſt
ɔved from all the *General Motives* of *Credibility*,
ich clearly mark this Church out to us, as the
ıſt *illuſtrious*, and therefore the moſt *credible* So-
ty upon Earth in Matters of Religion. Her Au-
ɪrity thus eſtabliſh'd is a legal and ſufficient Evi-
ıce even for thoſe Truths, which Reaſon cannot
hom. If then amongſt other Points ſhe propounds
her Children theſe two Articles, *viz.* the *Divine*
thority of *Scriptures*, and her own *Infallibility* in
tters of Religion, theſe two like *Chriſt* and St *John*
ıf Witneſs to each other. Yet having each a ſuf-

ficient Evidence from the *Motives* of *Credibility*, b which the Church proves her *Charter* for the De livery of *reveal'd Truths*, the Door is open, an there is no Danger of running round in a *vicio Circle.*

But, Sr, there is another thing, which deliver me from this Danger. For a *Circle* cannot be call' *vicious* with Reference to an Adverſary, who by hi own Principles is bound to admit of either of th Propoſitions, which prove each other reciprocall And therefore when I diſpute againſt a Member c the *Church of England*, who by his own Principles bound to believe the *Divine Authority* of *Scripture* I may legally maintain the *Church's Infallibility* gainſt him from thoſe ſacred Writings. Neither a I any ways bound to prove that they are the *Wo of God*, becauſe it is a *Principle* agree'd upon betwi us, and no Man is bound to prove a Principle his Adverſary's own Conceſſion. Nay, tho I myſe believed not a Word of the *New Teſtament*, I mig legally take the Advantage of it againſt a *Proteſtan* who believes it. For this is what we properly call *A gumentum ad hominem:* a certain cut-throat Way Confuting a Man from his own Principles. And ther fore, Sr, you cannot accuſe us of Running rou in a *vicious Circle* by proving the *Church's Infallibil* againſt *Proteſtants* from *Scripture.*

G. But ſuppoſe I ſhould deny the *New Teſtam* to be the *Word of God*, would not your *Lordship* th be left in the Lurch?

L. No, Sr, but you would have the Credit Denying your own Principles, and I the Trouble providing other Arms to fight againſt you as agai a *Jew*, or *Deiſt.* That is to ſay, I ſhould be oblig firſt to prove the *Church's Authority* in Matters Religion from ſuch Arguments or Motives, as

ancient Fathers made Uſe of for the Converſion of *Jews*; and then to prove the *Inſpiration* of *Scriptures* from that Authority.

§. 27.

The Being of a God may be believed upon the Authority of Scriptures, *or the* Church.

G. I Perceive, My Lord, you are fond of your « Circle, but I will bring you out of it. *p.* 36. «

L. Well then, Sr, let us have a Touch of your Skill.

G. Pray tell me, why do you believe a God? It « would be *Blaſphemy* to ſay you believe it upon any » *Authority*. For that would be to place ſuch an Au- « thority above God. And it would be Nonſenſe to « ſay you believe it either from the *Church* or the « *Scriptures*, becauſe you can believe neither with- « out firſt Believing that there is a God. What is « it then? We believe a God purely upon our own « *Reaſon*. And we cannot be more ſure that there is « a God, than we are perſuaded of the Truth of « thoſe Reaſons, upon which we do believe it. And « if God has given us no other Guide but our own « Reaſon with the Aſſiſtance of his holy Grace to « believe in himſelf; if this be all we have or can « have for the firſt and main Article of our Creed, « what further do we require for thoſe of leſs Con- « ſequence? And that we cannot have more than « this we may perceive by this Experiment, *viz.* « whether we believe moſt firmly, and with greater « Aſſurance, what we have only from our own *Rea* « *ſon*, or what we receive from the *Authority* of the « Church? For Example, are you not more undoub- « tedly aſſured of the *Being of a God*, which you be- «

» lieve purely upon your own Reaſon, than of *Tran-*
» *ſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, or whatever you believe
» upon the Authority of the Church? *pag.* 36.

L. Sr, if you have no other Way but this to conjure me out of the *Circle*; I may go round in it till Doomſday. Here is your Argument in other Words, which ſhews it's Weakneſs. *Reaſon can* perceive the *manifeſt Things of God*, as his *Being*, therefore it can, perceive the *hidden Things* too, as the *Myſteries* of *reveal'd Religion*. Is this a ſolid Way of Arguing, or becoming a Divine? Reaſon can diſcover the Perfections of a Deity which ſhine out in the Creation, therefore it can likewiſe diſcover it's *Divine Emanations*, which no Way appear; but are as ſecret as they are wonderful? Or do's it follow, *that it can find out the Son, whom no Man ever knew but the Father; or the Father, whom no Man ever knew but the Son, or they to whom the Son was pleaſed to reveal him!* Math. 11. ℣. 27. Finally, do's it follow that our Reaſon can diſcover the *Incarnation* of the Son of God, which St *Paul* calls *the Wiſdom of God hidden in a Myſtery?* 1. Cor. 2. ℣. 7. Suppoſe I believe a God purely upon my own Reaſon, is it a Conſequence, that the ſame natural Light of Reaſon without conſulting Authority can diſcover to me the *divine Revelation*, which directed the ſacred Penmen in their Writings, or enable me to Judge what Books are *canonical*, what not? It is evident that theſe Diſcoveries are abſolutely impoſſible to *natural Reaſon* not directed by *Authority*. And ſo my Believing a God purely upon my own Reaſon do's not render Authority leſs neceſſary for thoſe other reveal'd Truths, nor can it do you any Manner of Service againſt the Circle.

But are you in good earneſt when you tell me, that *it is Blaſphemy to believe a God upon the Authority*

ther of the Church or Scriptures? If ſo, then it follows *firſt*, that all young Perſons are bound to be *Atheiſts*, till they can underſtand the natural Demonſtration of a God. For if they believe a God upon any *Authority*, they become guilty of *Blaſphemy*. So that Nurſes, Parents, and Maſters muſt be very careful not to tell Children *that there is a God*, for Fear they ſhould believe it upon their Authority, and ſo become acceſſory to their *Blaſphemy*. And yet it is the firſt Thing Children are taught: becauſe it is the Groundwork on which all Religion is built. But whether they believe it upon *Evidence*, or the *Authority* of their Teachers (as Children and ignorant People, who underſtand not philoſophical Demonſtrations uſually do) the Effect is the ſame. And when they once believe it, let the Motive of their Belief be what it will, I think they may afterwards very ſafely believe it as a reveal'd Truth upon the *Authority* of the *Church* and *Scriptures*.

But if there be any Force in that Argument of yours, by which you will needs prove it to be *Blaſphemy* to believe a God upon any Authority, viz. *becauſe that would place ſuch an Authority above God*, if I ſay there be any Force in this Argument, it will follow *2dly*, that it is likewiſe *Blaſphemy* to believe a God purely upon our own *Reaſon*, becauſe that would place our Reaſon above God, if your Argument be worth a Rush.

Since therefore according to this Argument it is equally *blaſphemous* to believe a God either upon *Reaſon* or *Authority*, and ſince all Men are bound not to be guilty of *Blaſphemy*, it will follow *3dly*, either that Men muſt believe the *Being of a God* without having any *Reaſon* or *Motive* for it, or they muſt all live and die *Atheiſts* for Fear of being Blaſphemers, both which are moſt eminently abſurd. Thus,

Sr, inſtead of Conjuring me out of an innocent and harmleſs Circle, you have uſed your beſt Skill to conjure me out of all Religion.

Now let us examine the reſt. You tell me, *we cannot be more ſure that there is a God, than we are perſuaded of the Truth of thoſe Reaſons, upon which we believe it.* If you mean, that Reaſon muſt concur to Faith, and that we cannot believe, unleſs we be firſt convinced of the Reaſons, upon which we believe, what you ſay is true, but it makes nothing againſt us, who are perſuaded as much as you, that our Aſſent to all Myſteries of Faith is not to be a rash but a rational Aſſent grounded upon the ſtrongeſt Motives.

You go on thus. *And if God has given us no other Guide but our own Reaſon with the Aſſiſtance of his Grace to believe in himſelf; if this be all we have or can have for the firſt or main Article of our Creed, what farther do we require for thoſe of leſs Conſequence?* But, Sr, it is not all we have for the firſt and main Article of the Creed. For we have over and above the *Creed* itſelf propoſed by the Church as *divinely reveal'd*: And *divine Revelation* is ſomething more than *human Reaſon*; which tho it may ſuffice to diſcover to us the *manifeſt Things* of God, is unable to diſcover the *hidden Myſteries*, that are above it's Reach.

As to what you ſay concerning *Articles of leſs Conſequence*, I hope the Belief of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* are neceſſary to Salvation as well as that of the *Being of a God*. And can you pretend to demonſtrate either of theſe Myſteries by the Force of *human Reaſon?* If not, then ſomething farther is required for our Belief of them.

Laſtly, as to what you add by Way of Experiment, viz. *whether we believe moſt firmly, what we have only from our Reaſon, or what we receive upon the Authority*

ity *of the Church?* Sr, I should gueſs by this, that you have found by Experience, that you do not believe the Myſteries of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* as firmly as the *Being of a God*, ſince you have this from *Reaſon*, and the others from *Authority*. But if this be your Experiment, I thank God it is not ours. For we have a greater Certainty of what we believe upon the Motive of *divine Revelation* declared to us by the Church, than what we believe barely upon our *Reaſon*. And therefore if we had no Motive to believe the *Being of a God* but barely our own Reaſon, we should believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, and *Purgatory* with a much greater Aſſurance than the *Being of a God*. But ſince we believe this alſo upon divine Revelation, we have an equal *Certainty* of all Three, tho no *Evidence* but of the latter.

ADVERTISEMENT.

His Lordship *having told the* Gentleman *in his* Caſe ſtated, *that* God is obliged to give every Man an outward infallible Guide *(which certainly is a great Abſurdity) the* Gentleman *diſcourſes in the following Manner.*

§. 28.

Of Jews, Pagans, *and* Mahometans.

MY Lord, to ſay that *God is obliged to give every Man an outward infallible Guide* is Making too bold with Providence, and Meaſuring his infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs by our ſhort Line: God has made Creatures as it has pleaſed him: ſome incapable of Happineſs or Miſery, as the Inanimates, ſome capable only of Pleaſure or Pain;

V.

» as the *Animals.* And he has endow'd others with
» Reaſon as *Man*; and *left him in the Hands of his*
» *own Counſels; ſet Good and Evil, Life and Death be-*
» *fore him.* Deut. 11. ℣. 26. &c. and a free Will to
» chooſe, which he liketh. Again, of rational Crea-
» tures ſome, he has fix'd in Happineſs, as the bleſ-
» ſed in Heaven. Others are Veſſels of Wrath as
» the Angels that fell. But Man is betwixt theſe two
» to work out his Salvation by his Obedience to the
» Will of God, who will render to every Man ac-
» cording to his Deeds. For *as many as have ſinned*
» *without the Law ſhall be judged without the Law; and*
» *they that have ſinned in the Law, ſhall be Judged by*
» *the Law.* For *there is no Reſpect of Perſons with God.*
» Rom. 2. ℣. 11. 12. But according to you there is
» great *Reſpect of Perſons* with God, and his Goodneſs
» has fail'd the greateſt Part of Mankind ſince the
» Beginning of the World. Pray, My Lord, what
» outward Guide is there to *Jews*, *Heathens*, and *Ma-*
» *hometans?* And to the many Subdiviſions among
» all theſe? They have all Guides of their own, and
» the *Blind lead the Blind* with moſt of them. It is
» Fact that the Generality of Mankind do not chooſe
» for themſelves, but take their Religion upon
» Truſt as they are educated. And we muſt leave all
» this to God, who will require from none more
» than he has given. For God *is good to all, and his*
» *tender Mercies are over all his Works.* Pſ. 149. ℣. 9.
» pag. 36. 37. 38.

L. Sr, you have ſaid very fine Things, but very little to the Purpoſe, as will appear, when I have rectified the Miſtakes you run upon. *Firſt*, you charge me with Saying, that *God is obliged to give every Man an outward infallible Guide.* I believe indeed I ſaid ſo in our *former Converſation*, when I was under Tutelage, and ſpoke as my Maſter bid me. But as I am

now at Liberty to ſpeak my own Thoughts, I utterly diſown that Doctrine. For in Reality the Queſtion between us and *Proteſtants* is not, whether God be *obliged* to give is ſuch an *infallible Guide*, but whether he has been ſo *good* and *merciful* as to do it? and this is preciſely the Point I maintain. However

This firſt Miſtake has miſled you into a *ſecond* ſtill more injurious to me. For it repreſents me as guilty of downright Blaſphemy in Aſſerting it to be my Doctrine, 1. that *there is a Reſpect of Perſons with God* contrary to the expreſs Words of St *Paul:* and 2*dly*, that *his Goodneſs has fail'd the greateſt Part of Mankind.* But you muſt be very ignorant of St *Paul's* true Meaning as well as mine to charge me with ſuch impious Doctrine. For the *Reſpect of Perſons*, which St *Paul* ſpeaks of as being *far from God*, is a Rewarding or Punishing by *Favour* rather than by *Juſtice*, and without having that due Regard to Deeds, which is neceſſary for the juſt Diſtributing of Punishments or Rewards. It ſuppoſes Works on the one Hand, and a Conſideration due to them on the other: the Omiſſion whereof is a Defect of Juſtice, which God is wholly uncapable of. But there is no injuſtice in Beſtowing *Mercies* more liberally on ſome than others: becauſe all Acts of Mercy are *gratuitous*, and no Man can chalenge them as his due. Now the Giving us an *infallible Guide* is a *pure Mercy* of God; which therefore he may give to one, and not to another: as every Body is free to beſtow his Favours upon whom he pleaſes without any Danger of *Reſpect of Perſons* in the Senſe of St *Paul.*

Neither do's it follow hence, that *God's Goodneſs has fail'd the greateſt Part of Mankind.* For a Perſon can only properly be ſaid to *fail* one, when he either do's not make good his Word, or is Wanting to the Performance of any Thing, that is ſtrictly

due upon ſome juſt Title. But it is Nothing leſs than a Blaſphemy to accuſe God of either, in Relation to any one ſingle Creature in the World.

This anſwers your Queſtion concerning *Jews*, *Heathens*, and *Mahometans*. For ſuppoſe God has not given them any *outward infallible Guide*, what then? Will it follow, that he has not given one to *Chriſtians?* Or will you infer from it, that there is a *Reſpect of Perſons with God?* If he were bound to give one to all Mankind, you would have Reaſon on your Side. But ſince I know of no Obligation on the Part of God to give one to any, his having given one to *Chriſtians* is a *pure Mercy*, and being a *pure Mercy* is due to none, and he may give or refuſe it to whom he pleaſes according to theſe Words, *I will have Mercy on whom I will have Mercy, and I will have Compaſſion on whom I will have Compaſſion.* Rom. 9. ℣. 15.

You ſay, *God is good to all, and his tender Mercies are over all his Works.* Pſ. 145. ℣. 9. Very right, Sr. But God is infinitly *juſt* as well as *merciful*, and it is a groſs Preſumption to preſcribe Bounds to his *Juſtice* under Pretence of Magnifying his *Mercy*; ſo that it is not allow'd us to *meaſure* the one any more than the other by *our ſhort Line*, but we are bound to believe what the Scripture has reveal'd to us of both; which is, that he will ſhew his *infinite Mercy* on thoſe, who are in his Church perſeverantly by a living Faith, and his *infinite Juſtice* on all, who for their Sins are juſtly permitted to be out of it, whether they be, *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, *Heretiks* or *Schiſmaticks*.

As to what you ſay, that *the Generality of Mankind take their Religion upon Truſt, as they are educated:* I ſhould be glad to know, Sr, whether Education be a Proof of the Truth: Or whether this

lea will be admitted at the great Tribunal? If ſo, ıen no Man needs to examine the Grounds of his .eligion. 'Tis true, the Prejudices of Education are powerful Biaſs upon any Man's Judgment. But, f when a Perſon is come to riper Years, and has he Means of informing himſelf better, he be ſo areleſs, ſlothful, and indifferent as not to give ümſelf the Trouble to conſider whether thoſe Prejudices be well grounded, nor enquires into the *Marks* of the *true Church*, which are clear, and eaſy o be diſcover'd, when the Heart is ſincere; the Prejudices he has imbibed from Education will not excuſe him before God. Pray, Sr, was any Body ſa'ed from the Deluge, that was not in the *Ark* of *Noah?*

G. No, My Lord.

L. And 'twas the conſtant Language of the ancient 'athers, that it is as impoſſible to eſcape Damnation out of the *Church of Chriſt*, as it was to eſcape 'erishing out of the *Ark*. For ſurely no Man can be aved but through *Chriſt*.

G. No. But many may be ſaved by him, who « ever heard of him. *pag.* 38. «

L. Can *Faith* then be had without *Hearing?* Or ſalvation without *Faith* in *Chriſt?* This is joyful News for *Jews*, *Pagans*, and *Mahometans*. However o the beſt of my Judgment it is the general Doctrine of *Proteſtants* as well as *Catholicks*, that none of heſe are in the Way of Salvation.

Do's not Chriſt compare himſelf to a *Vine*, and n the Application of the Similitude tell us, that *if ve abide not in him, we ſhall be caſt forth as Branches vither'd and caſt into the Fire?* Joh. 15. ℣. 6. And can hoſe, who have not the *Faith of Chriſt*, be ſaid to abide in him? And if they abide not in him, will they not be doom'd to everlaſting Flames? Has he

not likewiſe told us that *if the Blind lead the Blind both ſhall fall into the Ditch*? Did not St *Peter* filled with the *Holy Ghoſt* declare to the *Rulers of the Jews and Elders of Iſrael*, that *Jeſus Chriſt is the Stone which is become the Head of the Corner; neither is there Salvation in any other. For there is no other Name under Heaven, whereby we muſt be ſaved.* Act. 4. ℣. 8. And do's not St *Paul* teach, that *without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God?* Heb. 2. ℣. 6.

» *G.* My Lord, Chriſt died to make Satisfaction » to the infinite Juſtice for the Sins of the whole » World: and took our Nature upon him to attone » for our fallen Nature, to be applied to ſuch as » perform the Conditions required. *pag.* 38.

L. Very right, Sr, Chriſt died, and has ſatisfied for all. But (as you obſerve very juſtly) his *general Satisfaction* can only profit thoſe, to whom it is applied by their Performance of the *Conditions required*. Now I have always been told, that there are two Conditions eſſentialy neceſſary. viz. *Baptiſm* and *Faith in Chriſt*.

» *G.* My Lord, God will Judge the *Gentiles* by the » Law of Morality, which is planted in their Hearts, » and we call *natural Religion*. But from Chriſtians he » requires *Faith in Chriſt* join'd with ſincere *Repen-* » *tance*. pag. 38.

L. Sr, as God is *Juſtice* itſelf, ſo tis certain the *Gentiles* will neither be judg'd, nor condemn'd but by a Law that is infinitly juſt. And I fear the Law Morality will not prove very favourable to ſuch as are deſtitute both of the Light of *Faith*, and the Fountains of Grace, the holy *Sacraments*. However according to you *Heathens* are in a ſafer and better Condition than *Chriſtians*, ſince you make them capable of Salvation not only without *Faith*, but without Practiſing thoſe Duties, which our Faith obliges us to.

G. But is it no Advantage then to have the «
ory of God reveal'd to us in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt? «
the Apoſtle ſpeaks. 2. Cor. 3. ℣. 6. And the Ef- «
cts of it upon us deſcribed, C. 3. ℣. 18. *viz.* that «
: all with open Face beholding as in a Glaſs the «
lory of God are changed into the ſame Image «
om Glory to Glory even as by the Spirit of the «
ord. The Sight of the wonderful Oeconomy of «
r Redemption muſt needs fill our Souls with «
apture and joy, when we behold the Glory of «
od in all his Attributes each exalting the other «
the uttermoſt, as it is ſaid, Jam. 2. ℣. 13. *The* «
ercy of God exalts his Juſtice. For Juſtice requires «
l Satisfaction, it cannot remit a Farthing. To re- «
t is Mercy and not Juſtice. And God is Juſtice «
the Abſtract, Juſtice itſelf. Here then infinite «
Wiſdom finds out a *full Satisfaction* to infinite Juſ- «
e: and infinite Goodneſs affords that Satisfac- «
n by the Incarnation, perfect Obedience, me- «
orious Paſſion, and glorious Reſurrection of the «
ly begotten Son of God. This inflames our De- «
tion, invigorates our Obedience, and gives «
mpunction to our Repentance when we have «
ned, and *come short of the Glory of God.* Rom. 3. «
23. God has vouchſafed to make a Covenant «
:h us in Chriſt, by Virtue of which we may ap- «
al to his Juſtice and Veracity. It is a Pardon «
n'd and ſeal'd by the King, which we may plead «
Court. The *Heathens* have not this, but they «
: ſtill under Mercy. They may ſay, *God is mer-* «
ul to forgive us. But we may ſay with St *John*, «
If God is faithful and juſt to forgive us our Sins, and «
cleanſe us from all Unrighteouſneſs. 1. Joh. 1. ℣. 9. «
his is a great a very great Advantage over the «
miles. But may not we enjoy the Advantage we «
ve over the *Heathens* with Thankfulneſs, and «

» not damn them all to the Pit of Hell? Becau
» God has made a *Covenant* with us, may we not lea
» them to *uncovenanted Mercy?* Is our Eye evil be
» cauſe he has been good to us? Or would we lim
» his Mercies to his Creatures, with whom we hav
» nothing to do? For *what have we to do with them*
» *that are without? them that are without God Judgeth,*
» 1. Cor. 5. ℣. 12. pag. 38. 39. 40.

L. I find, Sr, you are the Advocate general not only of *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, whom you have already brought off by their Belief of *common Chriſtianity*, but likewiſe of *Jews*, *Heathens*, and *Mahometans*, (for they are all upon the ſame Footing) whoſe Cauſe you have now pleaded with wonderful Eloquence. I ſhall take your Diſcourſe in Pieces, and ſay ſomething to every Part of it.

You begin with Enlarging upon the Advantages we *Chriſtians* have over the *Heathens*. Sr, we ſhould be very ungrateful to Almithty God, if we were not ſenſible of it. All therefore I pretended to advance when I ſpoke laſt was, that if *Heathens* can be ſaved *without Faith*, their Condition is ſafer and in a very weighty and material Point than that of *Chriſtians*, who cannot hope for that Happineſs without both humbling their Underſtandings under the Obſcurity of the Myſteries of Faith, and Subjecting their Wills to the Severity of it's Precepts: and ſo 'tis manifeſt you make *Heathens* have the better of us in Allowing them a Poſſibility of Salvation, without being ſubject to any of thoſe difficult and painful Duties, by which we are bound to purchaſe our eternal Happineſs.

This therefore I only infer'd as an Abſurdity from your Doctrine. For the Truth of the Matter is, we have the Advantage over them in every Reſpect, ſince nothing is more groundleſs, or more contra-

o the Word of God than the *uncovenanted Mercy* ou have ſo bountifully provided for them. You ell me the *Heathens* may ſay, *God is merciful to forive us:* and ſo may any *impenitent Sinner* ſay it with is much Truth as they; becauſe a *Heathen* continuing a *Heathen* is as incapable of Mercy, as a *Sinner* continuing a *Sinner*, according to this Sentence of our Saviour againſt Chriſtians not hearing the Church; *let him be to thee as a* HEATHEN; that is, is a *Reprobate*, or one in a damnable State. For it plainly follows hence, that to be a *Heathen*, and to be in a *damnable State* is one and the ſame Thing with our Saviour, who expreſſes the one by the other.

You conclude your Harangue with ſeveral Queſtions, the firſt whereof is, *whether we may not enjoy the Advantage we have over the Heathens without Damning them all to the Pit of Hell?* No, Sr, we cannot have a due Thankfulneſs for the great Benefit of our *Faith*, if we deny it's *Neceſſity*, and believe as you do, that we might have been ſaved, tho we had been *Heathens* left in Darkneſs as they are. For this is Annihilating the Benefit, and conſequently the Gratitude due for it under a ſpecious Pretence of Mercy to *Heathens*. But it is a falſe Mercy, which can do them no good, and may hurt the rash Abettors of it.

But, to turn your fine Rhetorical Queſtion upon yourſelf, cannot you enjoy the Advantages you have over *impenitent Sinners*, and the *Devils* without Damning them all to the Pit of Hell *for ever?* For let me tell you, Sr, your *uncovenanted Mercy* is of ſo very large a Size, that it may be extended to theſe as well as the *Heathens*. And all your other Queſtions may be retorted upon you in the ſame Manner.

But your laſt Queſtion expreſs'd in the Words

of St *Paul*, viz. (*what have we to do with them that are without? them that are without God Judgeth*) ſhews you to be an utter Stranger to the Apoſtle's true Meaning. For his Words bear no other Senſe than that the Church has no Right to exerciſe her Power of Correcting upon the *Heathens*, as being none of her Subjects: and therefore muſt leave them to God's Juſtice, as belonging to his Tribunal, not her's. But he could never intend to entitle them to your *unconvenanted Mercy* without Contradicting our Saviour ſaying, *he that believeth not is condemn'd already, becauſe he hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God.* Joh. 3. ℣. 18. nor without giving the Lie to himſelf: Since he tells us in expreſs Terms, that *without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.* Heb. 11. ℣. 6. I hope therefore it is no Crime to form a Judgment of the unhappy State either of *Jews*, *Heathens*, or *Mahometans* by the Lights, the *Word of God* itſelf has given us to Judge by, and that we may without having an *evil Eye*, or *limiting God's Mercies to his Creatures* pronounce thoſe condemn'd, on whom *Chriſt* himſelf and his *Apoſtle* have pronounced Sentence of Condemnation. Now, Sr, you may proceed, if you have any Thing more to ſay upon this Subject.

§. 29.

None ſaved without Faith *in* Chriſt.

» *G.* GOd did Judge one, who was *without*, that
» is, *out of the Pale of the Church*, to be the
» moſt beloved of God, and *that there was none like*
» *him in the Earth.* Job. 1. ℣. 8. And he is put upon
» the Level with the *greateſt in the Church*, as *Noah*
» and *Daniel.* Eze. 14. ℣. 14. And propoſed as an
» Example of Patience by St *James* 5. ℣. 11. And of

er *Gentile* it was ſaid by Chriſt, *I have not* «
o great Faith, no not in Iſrael. Luke 7. *v.* 9. «
e, who ſaid often to his Diſciples *O ye little* «
: and upbraided the Apoſtles with their «
ef, *Mark* 16. *v.* 14. Yet ſaid to a Woman «
man (who could not be diſcouraged with the «
ions, he put againſt her not being within «
le of the Church, but without among the «
O Woman great is thy Faith. Math. 15. *v.* 28. «
: the ten heal'd there was but one thankful, «
was a *Samaritan.* Luke 18. *v.* 16. that is a «
ıtick, a *Stranger*, as Chriſt here calls him, «
nd ſaid to him, *thy Faith has made thee whole.* «
», «

ir, you certainly take me for an errant Block-
» produce theſe four Examples, *viz.* of *Job*,
turion, the *Woman of Canaan*, and the *Leprous*
an for Proofs that Perſons may be ſaved with-
th in Chriſt. Did not *Job* believe in *Chriſt*, that
Meſſias to come? And how then can you ſay,
out of the Pale of the true Church?
lut was not *Job* a *Gentile?*
ir, if by the Word *Gentile* you mean an *Ido-*
n *Infidel*, or *Unbeliever*, *Job* was no *Gentile* any
nan *Adam*, or *Noah.* And were theſe out of
: of the *true Church?* Or had God no Church
arth before the *Jewiſh Synagogue*, and *ceremo-*
v were eſtabliſh'd?
nothing ſurpriſes me more than your men-
the *Centurion*, the *Woman of Canaan*, and the
Samaritan. To the firſt of which *Chriſt* ſaid,
not found ſo great Faith, no not in Iſrael. To
ond, *O Woman great is thy Faith:* And to the
hy Faith has made thee whole. Yet by a ſtrange
ht, theſe are the three other rare examples
re produced to prove, that Men may be ſaved

without Faith in Chriſt. I ask then, whether the *Centurion*, the *Woman of Canaan*, and the *Samaritan* believed in *Chriſt*, or not? If you ſay they did not, then *Chriſt* ſpoke an Untruth in Commending their *Faith*, which is Blaſphemy. If you ſay they did, then they were ſaved by their *Faith in Chriſt*: and theſe three Examples are as wide from the Purpoſe, as that of *Job*.

» *G.* The Pattern of Charity is placed in the Perſon of a *Samaritan* in Oppoſition both to a *Prieſt* » and *Levite*, Luke 10. ℣. 30. Which makes good » what St *Peter* ſaid of *Cornelius* a *Gentile*. Act. 10. » ℣. 30. *Now I truly ſee that God is no Reſpecter of* » *Perſons: But in every Nation he that feareth him, and* » *worketh Righteouſneſs, is accepted with him.* pag. 40. » 41.

L. That is, God makes no Difference between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who ſeek him with a ſincere Heart. But did not God even work a Miracle to bring this *Cornelius* to the Faith of *Chriſt*? And is not this a rare Proof that it is not neceſſary to Salvation! But let us hear out the reſt of your Story.

» *G.* This is the Doctrine, which *Chriſt* taught, » *Luke* 4. ℣. 25. When he minded the *Jews* that a » *Widow* of *Sarepta* a City in *Sidon*, and *Naaman* » the *Syrian* were prefer'd to all the *Widows* and *Le-* » *pers* in *Iſrael*. Which ſo enraged the *Jews* tena- » cious of the Priviledge of their Church, *that they* » *thruſt him out of their City, and led him unto the Brow* » *of their Hill, whereon their City was built, that they* » *might caſt him down headlong. And it is ſaid that they* » *were fill'd with Wrath.* pag. 41.

L. Here are three Examples more full as good as the four former, and the Scriptures equally trifled with. For is not this a ſtrange ſort of Argument! A *Samaritan* had more Compaſſion than a *Prieſt* or

Levite, and took Care of a wounded Man: A *Prophet* went to the *Widow* of *Sarepta*, and *Naaman* the *Syrian* was cured of a Leproſy: Therefore *Heathens* may be ſaved without *Faith in Chriſt*. Really, Sr, I am weary of Hearing the Scriptures thus abuſed, and ſhall ſhortly want ſome Grains of *Job's* Patience to hear you out. However proceed.

G. The like Fury they ſhew'd, when St *Paul* « told them, that the Goſpel was to be extended « beyond the Pale of their Church, and that God « had ſent him to the *Gentiles*. *And they gave him Au-* « *dience unto that Word, and then lift up their Voices,* « *and ſaid, away with ſuch a Fellow from the Earth. And* « *they cry'd out, and caſt off their Cloaths, and threw* « *duſt into the Air.* Act. 22. ℣. 22. And the like Rage « is ſeen among the zealots of your Church, when « they hear of the *Goſpel* being extended out of the « Pale of their Communion, tho with *Chriſtians*, « who hold the three ancient *Creeds*, and have every « Thing eſſential to a Church, except what *Rome* « has made ſo, *viz.* the *Univerſal* and unlimited *So-* « *vereignty* of her Bishop. *pag.* 41. «

L. Sr, your Compariſon between the *Jews* and us will not recommend either your Judgment or Charity; The *Jews* bore a mortal Hatred to the *Gentiles*: and therefore had not the Patience to hear any one ſay, they could be render'd capable of Salvation by having the *Goſpel* preach'd to them, or any other Way than by becoming *Jews*. This was the true Occaſion of their exceſſive Rage againſt St *Paul*, who told them he was ſent by God to preach the *Goſpel* to them. But was there ever any *Roman Catholick* in the World guilty of ſuch black malice, as to be enraged to ſee the *Goſpel* extended to *Infidels*? Do we not dayly pray for it? Nay have we not Seminaries expreſſly founded for the Education

of Perſons, whoſe whole Buſineſs it is to ſacrifice themſelves for that holy End? And where then is the Senſe or Juſtice of your Compariſon?

Ay but *the Jewiſh Rage is ſeen among the Zealots of our Church, when they hear of the Goſpel being extended out of the Pale of their Communion, tho with Chriſtians, who hold the three Creeds, and have every Thing eſſential to a Church.* Really, Sr, I pity your Miſtake. For I take it to be a fundamental Truth, that the *Church of Chriſt*, and by Conſequence the *Creeds* and *Goſpel* rightly underſtood can only be in *one Communion*, which we heartily wish may be extended to all Nations in the World. And we are ſo far from being enraged againſt thoſe, that have cut themſelves off from that Communion by *Apoſtacy* or *Hereſy*, that we heartily compaſſionate their Condition, and pray and labour continually for their Converſion. But we can never be perſuaded that any *heretical Communion* has *all the Eſſentials of the true Church of Chriſt*, whereof *Unity of Faith* (without which there is no Salvation according to St *Paul*) is one. As to the *unlimited Sovereignty* (as you call it) of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* it is neither an Article of our Faith, nor any Term of *Communion*. So you need not be afraid of it. The *ſpiritual Supremacy* of St *Peter's Succeſſor* is indeed an Article of Faith; but it is one of *Chriſt's* own Making, as has been fully proved.

» *G.* This is the great Bone of Contention, where-» in *Rome* ſtands ſingle, thruſting all *Chriſtian Chur-*» *ches* from her, like a Man in a Boat, who thinks » he thruſts the Shore from him, whereas he only » thruſts himſelf from the Shore: As *Firmilian* ſaid » to *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome excidiſti teipſum, noli te* » *fallere.* Do not deceive yourſelf, you have cut » yourſelf off from the Church. For he is truly a » *Schiſmatick* who has made himſelf an Apoſtate from

the Communion of the Eccleſiaſtical Unity. For « while you think you can excommunicate all other « Churches from you, you have only excommuni- « cated yourſelf from them. *Dum enim putas omnes* « *abs te abſtineri poſſe, te ipſum abſtinuiſti.* Cyp. Epiſt. « 75. pag. 41. 42. «

L. Sr, the *Pope's Supremacy* is the great Bone of Contention with *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, juſt as the rightful Prerogative of the Crown is the great Bone of Contention with *rebellious Subjects*. And the *Church* of *Rome* has the ſame Reaſon to thruſt *Hereticks* from her, as a lawful Sovereign to attaint *Rebels*.

As to *Firmilian*, and St *Cyprian*, they were certainly engaged in a wrong Cauſe, as you yourſelf muſt own. And if you had produced their Words to prove that they denied the Pope's *Infallibility*, you would have ſpoken to the Purpoſe. But *Infallibility* and *Supremacy* are two Things. For tho it be very probable that they denied the former, they never queſtion'd the latter; but only blamed Pope *Stephen* for Making an ill Uſe (at leaſt as they thought) of his Authority againſt them. And therefore told the Pope, that if he ſhould excommunicate the *Euſtern Biſhops* unjuſtly, he would only hurt himſelf by it: Which is the true Meaning of their Words. But you will have ſome Difficulty to ſhew, that the *Church of Rome* excommunicates *Hereticks* unjuſtly.

§. 30.

The Subject of Supremacy *and* Iufallibility *reſumed.*

G. MY Lord, the Church of the *Jews* had a « much ſtronger Plea for her *univerſal Su-* « *premacy* and *Infallibility*, becauſe all Proſelytes of « whatever Nations muſt come to her. For there «

» was no other Viſible Church of God upon Earth
» and the Sacrifices were limited to the Temple at
» *Jeruſalem*. Accordingly we find, *Act.* 8. ℣. 27. that
» the *Eunuch* came out of *Ethiopia* to *Jeruſalem* for
» to worship. *pag.* 42.

L. Sr, the *Jewiſh Church* had perhaps as ſtrong a Plea for the *Supremacy* of her *high Prieſt* over all the *Jews*, as the *Church of Chriſt* has for the *Supremacy* of St *Peter's Succeſſor* over all *Chriſtians*. And where is the Inconveniency of it? We ſhall conſider her *Infallibility* hereafter, which is a very different Thing.

But what you add, viz. *that all Proſelytes of whatever Nations were bound to come to the Jewiſh Church*, is the ſame as if you told me, that all, who turn'd *Jews*, were bound to come to the *Jewiſh Church*: which is very true indeed, but nothing to the Purpoſe. Becauſe none of thoſe, who were true Believers among the *Gentiles*, were bound to turn *Jews*; that is, embrace the Law of *Circumciſion*; Neither were theſe obliged to come to *Jeruſalem* to offer their *Sacrifices*, but were at Liberty to offer them to the *true God*, where-ever they pleaſed. 'Tis true, many of the *Gentiles* themſelves, eſpecially the true Believers among them, had a great Veneration for the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, where God was truly worshipped: And, if the *Eunuch* you ſpeak of, was a *Gentile*, this was doubtleſs the Occaſion of his Coming thither to worship. I ask you then, whether this *Eunuch* was a *Jew* or *Gentile*? If a *Jew*, your Argument is frivolous. For there is no doubt but *Jews* could Sacrifice no where but at *Jeruſalem*. If he was a *Gentile*, then all *Gentiles* were not *Infidels*. For he, who came to adore the *true God*, could not ſurely be an *Infidel*.

But, Sr, I am ſtill in Expectation of the inferences you will draw from what you ſaid laſt.

G. My

G. My Lord, the laſt thing I ſaid was, *that the Sacrifices were limited to the Temple at Jeruſalem.* Now « if the *Chriſtian Sacrifice* of the *Body* and *Blood of* « *Chriſt* (the moſt *ſolemn Worship* of God) were con- « fined to St *Peter's Church* at *Rome*, and could be had « no where elſe; as the moſt ſolemn Worship of « God (the *legal Sacrifices*, which were the *Types* of « the *Chriſtian*) were confined to the Temple at *Jeru-* « *ſalem:* And if the *Church of Rome* like that of the « *Jews*, were the only Church in the World, yet « after all would the *Church of Rome* have no more « Pretence to *Infallibility*, and *Perpetuity*, than that « of the Jews had. *pag.* 42. «

L. Sr, with your good Leave, the *Church of Rome*, that is, the *Church in Communion with the See of Rome* is the only true *Church of Chriſt* upon Earth: And the *Chriſtian Sacrifice* of the *Body and Blood of Chriſt* (which we call the *Maß*; and you, to my moſt agreeable Surpriſe, call *the moſt ſolemn Worship of God*) is ſo confined to the Church *in Communion with the See of Rome*, that it cannot be legally offer'd in any other *Communion.*

But all this is foreign to the Purpoſe. For that which gives *this Church* her Title to a *perpetual Infallibility*, and which the *Jewiſh Church* never had, are preciſely the *Promiſes of Chriſt.* If you can prove that theſe are of no Weight, then you will ſay ſomething to the Purpoſe.

G. My Lord, As the Church of the Jews has « been *cut off* for her Diſobedience to the Law of « God, ſo (as before mention'd) has it been ſaid to « the *Church of Rome* particularly, *thou ſhalt alſo be* « *cut off*, that is, upon the ſame Condition, *if thou* « *continueſt not in the Goodneß of God.* Rom. 11. ℣. 22. « pag. 43. «

L. Sr, this wretched Objection has already been anſwer'd (§. 23.) ſo pray go on.

» *G.* And we cannot imagine there should be a » *Church of Rome* viſible as now with a *Pope* at the » Head of it, and a Number of *Biſhops*, *Cardinals*, » *&c.* under him holding the true Chriſtian Faith, » when that Time comes, which our Saviour fore- » told *when the Son of Man cometh, ſhall he find Faith* » *upon Earth?* For then it would be found, and very » *viſibly* at *Rome.* pag. 43.

L. Sr, I hope it will be *viſibly* found at *Rome* as well as in many other Places. And ſince the Pope, and his Biſhops have in all former Perſecutions been the ſtrongeſt Bulwark of the *Church of Chriſt*, ſo I have no Reaſon to doubt, but they will be ſo in the Days of *Antichriſt*, tho their Reſidence should be in *Caves* and *Deſarts.*

But ſuppoſe *Chriſt* at his ſecond Coming should not find Faith at *Rome*, what is the Conſequence? Is the *City* of *Rome* eſſential to the *Preſervation*, or *Viſibility* of the *Church* of *Chriſt?* If *Rome* were buried under Ground by an Earthquake, would *Chriſt* loſe his *Church?* Or would the Church be diſabled from chooſing a *Succeſſor* to St *Peter?* However you do well to give me this plain Hint that by the *Church* of *Rome* you mean preciſely the *City* or *Dioceſs* of *Rome.* And this is already your fifth of ſixth Relapſe into the ſame wretched equivocation. As to your Text from St *Luke*, it was fully anſwer'd before (§. 24.) and ſo you may once more go on, if you pleaſe.

§. 31.

No general Defection *foretold by* Chriſt.

C. MY Lord, that State of the Church (*viz.* « at the *ſecond Coming of Chriſt*) is better « repreſented by the 7000. who had not bow'd to « *Baal*, but of whom *Eliah* knew none, was a State « of Segregation. There were particular Perſons, « who kept the *Faith*, but inviſible to the World, « or to one another: without any publick Wor- « ſhip, or ſo much as private Meetings. For *Eliah* « would ſurely have known of theſe, and been the « principal amongſt them. Far leſs could they have « had an *organiz'd Church* with *Paſtors* and *Rulers* o- « ver them without being known to *Eliah*, and to « many more, even to their Perſecutors, who found « out the moſt private Receſſes of the primitive « Chriſtians, and their Meetings, tho in the moſt « ſecret Manner for divine Worship; and their « Biſhops too, whom they hauled to Priſons, and « to Martyrdom: For they could not lye hid. And « the Faith was then viſible, tho under Perſecution. « Therefore it muſt be a much more univerſal De- « pravity and Corruption of the Church, of which « our *Saviour* Spoke, when *Faith ſhould not be found*, « at leaſt viſibly, *upon Earth*. pag. 43. 44. «

L. Sr, our Saviour never ſaid nor meant any ſuch Thing, if we may believe St *Auſtin*, and St *Jerom* above mention'd [§. 24.] the *Donatiſts* indeed, whoſe Company you have no Reaſon to be proud of, maintain'd your Doctrine, and quoted the ſame Paſſage of St *Luke*, which you now repeat the third Time, as if not Anſwer'd. But the whole *Catholick Church* oppoſed them, and St *Auſtin* and St *Jerom*

were her principal Champions. Both of them refuted the corrupt Interpretation of the *Donatiſts*, and both explain'd our Saviour's Words in a Senſe oppoſite to yours. So that your Saying, *that the State of the Church at the ſecond Coming of Chriſt is repreſented by the* 7000. *who had not bow'd to Baal*, is Begging the Queſtion. For you confidently ſuppoſe that your Interpretation of our Saviour's Words, tho contradictory to the Senſe of the ancient Fathers, ſtands good: which will never be granted. And ſo your Flourish upon *Eliah's not knowing the ſmall Number of true Believers, and his imagining himſelf to be alone*, might have been ſpared. In Effect, all you can prove from it is, that as the *Church of God* was in the Days of *Eliah* almoſt utterly ruined in *Iſrael*, ſo it may at other Times fail in any other *particular Nation*: Which no Man ever doubted of, ſince there are but too many deplorable Examples of it. But this is no Argument to prove, that the *true Faith* will ever be ſo hid, and ſuppreſs'd throughout the whole World, that they, who have a deſire to embrace it will not know where to find it. Neither was this the Condition of the Church in the Days of *Eliah*. For tho it was oppreſſed to a very great Degree, and almoſt utterly extirpated in *Iſrael*; it flourish'd at that very Time as much as ever in the Kingdom of *Juda* under the pious *Joſaphat*, who was contemporary with *Eliah*. But this you did not think fit to mention becauſe you knew it would ſpoil your fine Flourish to all Intents and Purpoſes. If you have any Thing more to ſay, pray let us have it.

» *G.* The State of the Church before the *ſecond* » *Coming of Chriſt* will be like to that before the » *Flood* repreſented by the *Ark*. Wherein few, that » is, eight Souls were ſaved. And as the Corruption

f the old World was great, we may ſuppoſe « he Corruption to be greater before the *ſecond* « *oming of Chriſt*, as the deſtruction by *Fire* is more « errible than that by *Water*. However ſuch a ge- « ieral Corruption is here foretold, as will in no « Ways conſiſt with the leaſt Sort of that *Viſibility*, « vhich the *Church of Rome* requires as a Mark of « he *true Church*, and to continue with her for ever. « *ag.* 44. «

L. Sr, you are ſtill Begging the Queſtion, and uilding upon your former modeſt Suppoſition, hat your Interpretation of St *Luke* is preferable to hat of the Ancient Fathers: which, I make bold to eny and ſhall always do, till you either convince ne that the *Donatiſts*, who have taught you your Leſſon, were no *Hereticks*; or that the Interpreta- tion of *Hereticks* is to be preferr'd before that of the *Orthodox Fathers* of the Church.

'Tis true indeed the World will be very corrupt before the *ſecond Coming* of *Chriſt*; and 'tis of this *great Abundance* of wicked and *Scarcity* of good Men our Saviour's Words of St *Luke* may be underſtood according to St *Auſtin*. But the *Wheat* and *Tares*, that is, the *Good* and *Wicked* are to grow together in the *ſame Field* [the *Church*] and this Field will be very Viſible even *until the Harveſt*: when both the *good* and *Wicked* will be conſumed by *Fire*: which ſpoils in ſome Meaſure your witty Reflexion upon the Diffe- rence between the two Elements of *Fire* and *Water*.

But pray, Sr, do's not *Chriſt* tell us that the laſt terrible Perſecution of *Antichriſt* will be shorten'd for the Sake of the *Elect*? Now I preſume the *Elect* will not diſſemble their *Faith*, but profeſs it open- ly: and if they profeſs it openly, will not the Church be *Viſible* in their Perſons? Will not *Enoch* and *Eliah* appear viſibly upon Earth to maintain the true Faith

againſt the wicked *Antichriſt*? Finally, do's not the Word of God expreſsly tell us, that the *Jews* will be converted, and brought into the fold of Chriſt's Church before the End of the World? And how then can it be true, that Faith will not be found upon Earth at his *ſecond Coming*? For ſurely the Jews will not be converted by *inviſible Paſtors*, but by Men openly Profeſſing and Preaching the *Faith of Chriſt*. All which are ſufficient Proofs to convince any Man, that the *Church of Chriſt* will be *Viſible* to the End of the World, and that Faith will be found upon Earth at our Saviour's ſecond Coming.

» *G.* But, My Lord, allowing now that there » will be a *viſible Church* in thoſe Days, then that » Church, at leaſt the *Generality*, which is the *Vi-* » *ſibility*, will fall from the Faith, elſe it will be *vi-* » *ſibly* to the found upon Earth. And then Men will » be miſled by the *Church*, and thoſe Marks of *Vi-* » *ſibility*, which the *Church of Rome* gives her; in like » Manner as they were miſled by the Church be- » fore, when ſhe commanded them to reject the » *Meſſias*. He *came unto his own*, the Church of the » *Jews*, the only viſible Church then upon Earth, » but *she received him not*. Joh. 1. ℣. 11. For she was » corrupt and blinded under the Mask of Phariſai- » cal Sanctity, and ſtrict Obedience of the Law, » even the *Tithing of Mint*, *Anice*, *and Cummin*: she » was zealous in the outward Obſervances, but ne- » gleƈted the weightier Matters of the Law, *Judg-* » *ment*, *Mercy*, and *Faith*. Math. 23. ℣. 23. And ſo » it may be at the *ſecond Coming* of Chriſt, as it was » at the *Firſt*; for there is no more Promiſe of In- » fallibility to the one State of the Church than to » the other. *pag.* 44. 45.

L. What, Sr! May it be ſo at the *ſecond Coming* of *Chriſt* in Spite of his poſitive Promiſe made to

he *Chriſtian Church*, that *he will be with her to the End f the World!* Math. 28. ℣. 20. This alone, Sr, is an nanſwerable Proof that the *viſible Church* at that ime will not fall from the *Faith*, but that *Faith* ill then be *viſibly* found upon Earth; and that by onſequence Men will not then be miſled by the hurch's *Viſibility*.

However I muſt here beg the Favour of you to xplain to me the dark Riddle you have juſt now ropoſed, *viz.* that *allowing a viſible Church in thoſe ays*, yet *that Church will then fall from the Faith*. Sr, f you mean that Church, which will be model'd by *Antichriſt*, who in all Probability will be the laſt *Reformer* in the World, there is no Doubt but his hurch will be both *viſible*, and wholly *void of Faith*. ut I think you and I have been hitherto Diſputing oncerning the *true Church of Chriſt*: and the Queſion between us is preciſely this, *viz.* whether *this rue Church of Chriſt* will be *viſible* in thoſe Days? ow *Allowing* (as you do) this Church to be *viſible* n thoſe Days, I ſhould be glad to know how it can t the ſame Time be the *true Church of Chriſt*, and a *hurch faln from the Faith*, nay and Miſleading People y it's *Viſibility*? This I confeſs appears to me to be Contradiction not eaſy to be reconciled.

But the Words you conclude with, are very Surrizing; viz. *that there is no more Promiſe of Infallibiy to the one State of the Church than to the other*. That , to the *Church of Chriſt*, than to the *Jewiſh Synaogue*. For ſurely, Sr, you can never flatter yourlf, that any Man in his Senſes will believe this, nleſs you firſt convince him that *God* made a Proiſe to the *Synagogue*, that *the Gates of Hell ſhould ver prevail againſt it*. Math. 16. ℣. 18. and *that he ould be with it all Days even unto the End of the World*. lath. 28. ℣. 20. Nay, on the contrary, the *Fall* of

the Jewish Church is clearly foretold in the *Old Testament*.

» *G.* And in the *New Teſtament*, that *Chriſt* at his » *ſecond Coming* ſhould not find Faith upon Earth, » *pag.* 45.

L. Sr, the *Donatiſts* with their *Proteſtant* Brethren may find this in the *New Teſtament*, but the *ancient Fathers* could find no ſuch Thing; whereas they all clearly ſaw the Propheſies foretelling the *Apoſtacy* of the *Jews*.

§. 32.

The Difference between the Synagogue, *and the* Church of Chriſt.

» *G.* MY Lord, the *Jews* did not underſtand the » *Propheſies* againſt themſelves. They ſaid, » that the *Church* was the only *Interpreter* of Scrip- » tures; and ſhe muſt take the Law from the Mouth » of her Prieſts. And the *Church* did interpret theſe » *Scriptures* otherwiſe than *Chriſt* did. *pag.* 45.

ADVERTISEMENT.

To theſe laſt Words of the Gentleman *his* Lordſhip *in the former* converſation *is ſo weak as to anſwer, that* Chriſt being come he was then the Church, *and the* Gentleman *refutes him in a very ſerious Manner. Which trifling Stuff is here omitted.*

L. SR, as to what you tell me, viz. *that the Jews did not underſtand the Propheſies againſt themſelves*, I muſt make bold to put you in Mind of what you ſaid in your *Chriſtianity demonſtrated* where after

upon Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, that has ſuch *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But ſince the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, I tell you once more that your Comparing the Danger of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that of the *Jewiſh People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſenſical, as it is Malicious.

In a Word, the Difference between the *Synagogue* and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *Church in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is manifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to ſee it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit of Truth ſhall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. ℣. 16. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of the World*. Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was ever made to the *Jewiſh Church*; on the Contrary her Apoſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was manifeſtly foretold.

G. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſtion of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the *Meſſias*. For that they deny, and bid us prove it. That is the whole Queſtion between them and us. *pag.* 45. 46.

L. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging the Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evidence from their own Prophets as explain'd by their own Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of J. *Chriſt*.

G. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the *Authority* of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the Rulers or Phariſees believed in him? But this People, who knoweth not the Law is curſed.* Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And they ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub.* Math. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in this Caſe, the *People* or the *Church?* Upon the Foot of the *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People, and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

upon Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, that has ſuch *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But ſince the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, I tell you once more that your Comparing the Danger of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that of the *Jewiſh People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſenſical, as it is Malicious.

In a Word, the Difference between the *Synagogue* and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *Church in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is manifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to ſee it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit of Truth ſhall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. ℣. 16. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of the World*. Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was ever made to the *Jewiſh Church*; on the Contrary her Apoſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was manifeſtly foretold.

G. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſtion of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the *Meſſias*. For that they deny, and bid us prove it. That is the whole Queſtion between them and us. *pag.* 45. 46.

L. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging the Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evidence from their own Prophets as explain'd by their own Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of J. *Chriſt*.

G. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the *Authority* of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the Rulers or Phariſees believed in him? But this People, who knoweth not the Law is curſed.* Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And they ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub.* Math. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in this Caſe, the *People* or the *Church*? Upon the Foot of the *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at

» that Time for any Man to be a *Chriſtian*. And there-
» fore of all Men Chriſtians have the leaſt Reaſon to
» inſiſt upon this. *pag.* 46.

L. What, Sr, have *Chriſtians* of all Men in the World the leaſt Reaſon to inſiſt upon the *Authority* of the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt himſelf!* This would ſound well in the Mouth of an *Independent*; but if this be the Doctrine of your Church, I pray God to preſerve me from ever being a Member of it. I am ſure St *Paul* preach'd no ſuch Doctrine. On the contrary in his Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* he takes Care to inſtruct them in the important Leſſon of *Submiſſion* to their ſpiritual Guides. *Obey them that have the Rule over you, and ſubmit yourſelves.* Heb. 13. ℣. 17. And ſurely when Chriſt ſaid, *he that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican*, he did not intend her *Authority* ſhould either ſtand for a Cypher, or be a ſource of Seduction to thoſe, who ſhould pay a Submiſſion to it.

You ſay the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* inſiſted upon the *Authority* of their *Church*. I anſwer they might have lawfully done it: if there had not been *unconteſtable* Evidence againſt it: and therefore *Roman Catholicks* have a full Right to inſiſt upon the *Authority* of their Church, till the like *manifeſt* and *unconteſtable Evidence* be produced againſt it by *Proteſtants*: which is the very Thing we have always moſt earneſtly demanded ever ſince the *pretended Reformation*, but never could obtain.

You add, that the *Rulers* or *Phariſees* attributed *Chriſt's Miracles* to *Beelzebub*, and ask, *who was to be the Judge in this Caſe, the People or the Church?* I anſwer, neither the one nor the other. For *Chriſt* was then the only *infallible Judge*, and his Works gave Teſtimony that his Commiſſion was from God, and could not be queſtion'd but by ſuch as were rotten

at Heart, poiſon'd with Malice, and reſolved not to yield to the Truth. I heartily wish it may not be the Caſe of many at this Time.

As to their Attributing *Chriſt's Miracles* to *Beelzebub*, I anſwer, this was the moſt flagrant Inſtance of the Corruption of their Hearts, and of the moſt conſummate Malice reduced to it's very laſt Shift. Nay *Chriſt* himſelf calls it *Blaſphemy* againſt *the Holy Ghoſt*. That is, Denying the manifeſt Truth, and Shutting their Eyes againſt the cleareſt Light. In Effect this Proceeding was as exorbitantly irrational, as if they had attributed all the wonderful Works of God to the Operations of *Satan*.

Laſtly you tell me, *it was impoſſible at that Time for any to become a Chriſtian upon the Foot of the Authority of the Church*. To which I anſwer briefly as before, *viz.* that the *Authority* of the *Jewiſh Church* was not to be regarded, or obey'd, when it commanded the *Rejection* of our Saviour; becauſe there was *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt the Lawfulneſs of it: as a Child is not bound to obey his Father, if he commands him to commit Murder: nay he is bound not to obey him.

But I preſume, that all you have now ſaid is only to prepare me to relish your darling Doctrine of *private Judgment* in Oppoſition to *Church Authority*.

§. 33.

Of private Judgment.

G. MY Lord, *private Judgment* is all we have « for the Belief of a *God*, and of *Chriſt*, « and by your own Conceſſion for the *Choice of a* « *Church*. And then we may well truſt to it in ſmal- « ler Matters. In ſhort, *we muſt truſt to it in every* «

» *Thing without Exception.* For it is as impoſſible to » believe any Thing without our underſtanding, as » to ſee without Eyes. *pag.* 46.

L. Sr, if you mean nothing more when you ſay, *that we muſt truſt to private Judgment in every Thing without Exception*, than that we muſt never believe any Thing unreaſonably, that is, without a ſufficient Motive to believe it, I know not where you will find an Adverſary to fight againſt, and you only trifle with Words inſtead of Diſputing. For in this Senſe I believe all the dark *Myſteries* of *Chriſtianity* by my own *private Judgment*. Becauſe my own Judgment tells me, that nothing is more conſonant to Reaſon than to ſubmit in Things, that are above my Underſtanding, to the Deciſions of the *Church*, which is the greateſt Authority upon Earth, and eſtabliſh'd by God himſelf to direct me in the Way to Salvation.

Nay I likewiſe agree to what you ſay, *that private Judgment is all we have for the Choice of a Church:* becauſe the *Marks* of the *true Church* are of ſuch a Nature, as not to be above the Reach of a Man's Underſtanding to make a Judgment of them: whence it follows, that my own private Reaſon, after a diligent and impartial Examination of thoſe *Marks*, ſuffices to direct me to the *Church* I ought to chooſe for my *Guide*.

But when this Choice is once made, and when I have now found the true *Church* of *Chriſt* by the *Marks* that lead me to it, then the ſame Reaſon tells me, that it is moſt reaſonable to depend upon her Authority with an entire Confidence, and truſt to her in every Thing ſhe propoſes as a *reveal'd Truth*; without pretending to examine or canvaſs the *Myſteries* propoſed by her, or to dive into them by the meer Light of human Reaſon. And therefore

our Meaning be that we muſt employ our *private ſon* in Examining and Scanning thoſe very *Myſ-s*, which are above our Reaſon, and that we ht not to believe any Thing, but what our Rea- can comprehend, nothing is more falſe or per- ous than your Saying, *that we muſt truſt to it in y Thing without Exception.* For if we muſt thus t to it's Examination in every Thing without Ex- ion, I cannot ſee, how it is naturally poſſible that we muſt be miſled into a thouſand Errors, that there muſt be as great a Variety of *Reli-*, as there is of *private Judgments.* Pray tell me, is your *private Judgment* capable of Diſcovering, mining, or Underſtanding the Sublime Myſte- of the holy *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, *&c.*

. My Lord, my Reaſon tells me, that there « t be many Things in the Nature of God, which « nnot underſtand or explain: becauſe he is *in-* « *:*, and *incomprehenſible.* And theſe I take purely « n *Revelation*, that is given of them in holy « *ptures.* For my own Reaſon could never have « id them out, nor can perfectly underſtand « n. Th y are dark to me like a Country I ne- « ſaw. I cannot have a right Idea of it till I « e thither: as I cannot of *Heaven* or the State « *parate Souls.* Yet I cannot help framing ſome « ception to myſelf of what I know *never enter'd* « *the Heart of Man to conceive:* that is, aright, « according as theſe Things are. Therefore I « : not upon me to explain them. For that would « o involve myſelf, and I know that I muſt « tly err. *pag.* 47. «

. That's very right, Sr, and you do very pru- ly in not taking upon you to explain ſuch dark *teries.* But did not your Reaſon tell you juſt now, *private Judgment is to be truſted to in every Thing*

without Exception? And do's the ſame Reaſon not tell you again, that *there are many Things, which muſt be taken upon pure Revelation!* Or do you call this *Truſting to your private Judgment!* You may as well ſay, that a blind Man truſts to his own Eyes, when he follows his Guide. On the Contrary I call it *Subjecting* our *private Judgment* to the *Revelation* of *God*. I call it, as St *Paul* do's, *captivating our Reaſon and Underſtanding unto the Obedience of Faith.* In a Word, I call it ſubmitting in all matters of Faith to the *Deciſions* of the *Church.* Becauſe whatever I take purely upon *Revelation*, I take upon the *Authority* of the *Church* declaring ſuch and ſuch Myſteries to be Truths *divinely reveal'd.* For the *Church* is then properly my *Guide*, and the *Revelation* of *God* is the *Motive*, upon which my *Faith* is built: and my *Reaſon* acts no other Part than that of an *entire Submiſſion.* So that the true and only Uſe we are here to make of our Reaſon is in this one Act of Judging, that it is moſt reaſonable, that Men ſhould ſubmit to that Authority, which *Chriſt* himſelf has eſtabliſh'd. And upon this Head Faith is always rational, tho Reaſon can never diſcover, nor underſtand, nor explain the *Myſteries* propoſed.

» *G.* My Lord, it would be as much againſt Rea» ſon to deny theſe, as to deny there is any Coun» try in the World, or Star in the Firmament, which » I had not ſeen. *pag.* 47.

L. Very right, Sr; pray go on. For with a little Practice you'l learn to ſpeak Truth.

» *G.* And it would be much more unreaſonable » to think there is nothing in the Nature of the » *infinite*, which I did not comprehend; or becauſe » that cannot be expreſs'd but in Words adapted » to our Underſtanding, therefore to meaſure his » Nature by ours. And becauſe *Peter*, *James*, and

John

John are *three Men*, therefore to think, *Father*, *Son*, « and *Holy Ghoſt* muſt be *three Gods*. pag. 47. «

L. This, Sr, would be Denying the firſt Article of our *Creed*, and making *Reaſon* dictate *Blaſphemy* to us. Therefore we muſt take Care not *to truſt to it in every Thing without Exception.*

G. But when I ſay *three Perſons* with Relation to « the *Divine Trinity*, there comes not ſuch a Thought « in my Head as *three Perſons* of *Men*. But becauſe « *perſonal Actions* are attributed to each of the *Divine* « *three*, therefore we call them *Perſons*. Which « Words the Scripture applies to God. *Heb.* 1. ℣. 3. « But it is only *ad captum*, as the Schools ſpeak. « That is, condeſcending to our Capacity, as when « God is ſaid to *repent*, to *grieve*, *&c.* it is not that « we ſhould think it really ſo; for that would be « contradictory to the Nature of God. But it con- « veys a Notion to us that we ſhould act as if it « really were ſo, that God were *angry* and *grieved* « at our Sins, and would repent of the Bleſſings he « has given or promiſed to us, if we take not Heed « to walk in the Ways, he has ſet before us. *p.* 48. «

L. Sr, tho you have expreſs'd yourſelf ſomewhat odly, I am willing to put the beſt Conſtruction upon your Words, not doubting but you believe the incomprehenſible Myſtery of the *bleſſed Trinity* as we do: which *Deiſts* and *Socinians* deny: becauſe, ſay they, it is a Contradiction to the firſt Principle of *Reaſon*; and they will have nothing to do with *Revelation*, but think themſelves eaſier without it.

G. They will not find it ſo, when they conſi- « der, that they are in no leſs Difficulties upon fol- « lowing their own Reaſon only. For Example. They « allow a *firſt Cauſe* and *Creator* of all Things, be- « cauſe Nothing can make itſelf. And that firſt Cauſe « muſt have a *neceſſary Being*, and conſequently from «

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People; and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

rational Courſe we can take is to ſubmit our *private Judgment* to that *Authority*, which *Chriſt* himſelf has eſtabliſh'd upon Earth; *viz.* his *holy Church*, which St *Paul* calls *the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*

As for Inſtance, how can you convince any Man of the *Inſpiration* of *Scriptures* but from the *Authority* of the *Church?* For if you will not build your Belief of it upon that *Authority*, I ſee not what other Authority you can alledge for it.

G. Nor I neither. For I put it upon no Autho- « rity. It is *Evidence*, and not *Authority*, upon which « my Belief of *Scriptures* is founded. *pag.* 50. «

§. 34.

Of the Inſpiration *of* Scriptures. *And whether our Belief of it be founded upon* Evidence *excluding* Authority.

ADVERTISEMENT.

His Lordship's *Anſwer in the* Gentleman's Caſe ſtated *to what he ſaid laſt, is ſo remarkable a Piece of Nonſenſe, that the* Gentleman *himſelf gives him a civil Reprimand for it; and go's on thus.*

G. « *Authority* and *Evidence* are two Things. If « I believe a Thing for your telling me ſo « *without any other Reaſon*, then I believe it purely « upon your *Authority*. But if a Man I never ſaw « before makes a Thing very Evident to me, and « convinces my Reaſon; I believe not then upon « his Authority: for he has none with me, but up- « on the *Evidence* he gives me. And what that Evi- « dence is upon which we believe the holy *Scriptures* «

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People; and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

on, and own you have proved clearly enough the *Jews* and *Deiſts*, that the *ſacred Perſon*, we call *Chriſt*, is the *Meſſias* foretold by the *Prophets*. But as to any Proof, that either the *New Teſtament* were writ by *Divine Inſpiration* renders them preciſely the *Word of God*, and *of Faith*) I don't remember one ſingle Argu- n your Book relating to that ſubject. There ainly a large Difference between proving that *cts* contain'd in a Book are *true*, and that the , who wrote it, was *Divinely inſpired*. For ſe- Perſons have writ the Hiſtory both of the *Old* w *Teſtament*, and yet their Books are neither *cal Scriptures*, nor received by the Church as *ly inſpired*, tho the *Facts* contain'd in them be ily *true*.

v, Sr, the Point, we have before us (and 'tis it of very great Importance) is, how the *Re-* of *Scriptures* has been convey'd to us. I main- hat our Belief of it is wholly grounded upon *rity*, and ſo did St *Auſtin*, when he declared, *e would not believe the Goſpels themſelves, unleſs uthority of the Church induced him to it.* Contra Fund. C. 4. You on the contrary pretend, t is *Evidence*, and *not Authority*, *on which your of the Revelation of Scriptures is founded.* Your *ce*, therefore muſt be ſuch, as is wholly *inde-* of any *Authority*. But for my Part I know vo Sorts of *Evidence*, which are not founded any *Authority*, viz. the *Evidence* of our *Senſes*, ie *Evidence* of our *Reaſon*, which is properly eſult of a *Philoſophical* or *Mathematical* Demon- n. Now I preſume, Sr, your *Eyes* were never enough to ſee the *Revelation* of *Scriptures*. And ever gratify the World with a *Philoſophical thematical* Demonſtration of it, you will de-

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People; and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

on Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, at has ſuch *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But ice the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, ell you once more that your Comparing the Dan- r of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that the *Jewiſh People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſen- cal, as it is Malicious.

In a Word, the Difference between the *Synago-* e and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *burch in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is anifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to e it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit Truth ſhall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. .16. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of e World*. Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was er made to the *Jewiſh Church*; on the Contrary her poſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was mani- ſtly foretold.

G. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſ- « n of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the « *eſſias*. For that they deny, and bid us prove it. « at is the whole Queſtion between them and us. « ?. 45. 46. «

L. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evi- ce from their own Prophets as explain'd by their n Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of *Chriſt*.

G. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the « *thority* of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the* « *'ers or Phariſees believed in him? But this People,* « *knoweth not the Law is curſed*. Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And « y ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub*. « th. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in « Caſe, the *People* or the *Church*? Upon the Foot « the *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at «

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People; and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

ɔon Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, ıat has ſuch *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But nce the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, tell you once more that your Comparing the Dan-ɛr of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that f the *Jewiſh People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſen-cal, as it is Malicious.

In a Word, the Difference between the *Synago-ue* and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *hurch in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is ıanifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to ɛe it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit f Truth ſhall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. .16. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of e World*. Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was ver made to the *Jewiſh Church*; on the Contrary her poſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was mani-ſtly foretold.

G. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſ- «
ɔn of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the «
leſſias. For that they deny, and bid us prove it. «
hat is the whole Queſtion between them and us. «
ℊ. 45. 46. «

L. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging e Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evi-nce from their own Prophets as explain'd by their ɔn Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of *Chriſt*.

G. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the «
uthority of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the* «
lers or Phariſees believed in him? But this People, «
o knoweth not the Law is curſed. Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And «
ɛy ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub*. «
ıth. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in «
s Caſe, the *People* or the *Church*? Upon the Foot «
the *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at «

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People; and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

on Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, at has ſuch *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But ice the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, ell you once more that your Comparing the Dan- r of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that the *Jewiſh People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſen- al, as it is Malicious.

In a Word, the Difference between the *Synago-* e and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *hurch in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is anifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to e it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit Truth ſhall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. 16. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of World.* Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was er made to the *Jewiſh Church*; on the Contrary her oſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was mani- ſtly foretold.

G. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſ- « n of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the « *eſſias.* For that they deny, and bid us prove it. « at is the whole Queſtion between them and us. « ?. 45. 46. «

L. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evi- ce from their own Prophets as explain'd by their n Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of *Chriſt.*

G. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the « *thority* of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the* « *ers or Phariſees believed in him? But this People,* « *knoweth not the Law is curſed.* Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And « y ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub.* « th. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in « Caſe, the *People* or the *Church?* Upon the Foot « the *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at «

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People; and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

This, Sr, is the *Evidence*, you ſpeak of, placed in as advantagious a Light as it will bear. But all the Strength it has is built upon *Authority*. For *firſt*, the *Churches*, to which the *Copies* of this Epiſtle were ſent, could have no other *Evidence* of it's containing the *pure Word of God*, than what the *Romans* themſelves had; from whom they received thoſe Copies. And *2dly*, the *Romans* could have no other *Evidence*, that the *Original* contain'd the *pure Word of God*, than what *Phebè* had, who brought it to them from St *Paul*. If therefore *Phebè* herſelf had no other *Evidence* of it's containing the *pure Word of God* than the *Evidence* of *Authority*, your whole Syſtem of pretended *Evidence* without *Authority* is a meer *Chymera*.

Now tis manifeſt, that *Phebè* could have no other *Evidence*, than what I ſpeak of. For let us ſuppoſe, if you pleaſe, that *Phebè* not only received the Epiſtle to the *Romans* from St *Paul's* own Hands, and heard him declare that it contain'd the *reveal'd Word of God*, but even that she ſtood by, and ſaw him write it. 'Tis true indeed, that in the Suppoſition, I have made, it was *evident* to *Phebe's* Sight, that the Epiſtle was written by St *Paul*; and evident to her *Hearing*, that St *Paul* declared it to be the *Word of God*. But that it was really *the Word of God*, (And pray remark that our Queſtion is chiefly concerning the *Revelation* of *Scriptures*.) This was neither evident to her *Senſes* (for she could not ſee the *Revelation*.) Nor to her *Underſtanding* convinced by any neceſſary Concluſion drawn from firſt and known Principles. The Ground therefore of her Belief of it was not *Evidence* properly ſo call'd; but she believed it upon the *Credit*, and *unqueſtionable Authority* of a Perſon, whoſe Veracity she could not ſuſpect. So that her Belief of that Epiſtle's containing the

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People, and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

)on Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, .at has ſuch *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But ıce the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, :ell you once more that your Comparing the Dan- :r of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that the *Jewiſh People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſen- :al, as it is Malicious.

In a Word, the Difference between the *Synago-* e and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *urch in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is ınifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to : it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit Truth ſhall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. 16. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of World*. Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was er made to the *Jewiſh Church*; on the Contrary her ›oſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was mani- tly foretold.

G. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſ- « n of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the « *ſſias*. For that they deny, and bid us prove it. « ıat is the whole Queſtion between them and us. « ?. 45. 46. «

L. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging : Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evi- ıce from their own Prophets as explain'd by their n Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of *Chriſt*.

G. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the « *ıthority* of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the* « *lers or Phariſees believed in him? But this People,* « *o knoweth not the Law is curſed.* Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And « :y ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub.* « ıth. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in « s Caſe, the *People* or the *Church?* Upon the Foot « the *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at «

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People, and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

pon Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, iat has ſuch *uncontestable Evidence* againſt it. But nce the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, tell you once more that your Comparing the Dan- :r of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that the *Jewish People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſen- :al, as it is Malicious.

In a Word, the Difference between the *Synago-* e and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *urch in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is anifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to : it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit Truth shall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. 16. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of World*. Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was er made to the *Jewish Church*; on the Contrary her ›oſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was mani- tly foretold.

G. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſ- « n of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the « *eſſias*. For that they deny, and bid us prove it. « iat is the whole Queſtion between them and us. « ?. 45. 46. «

L. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging : Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evi- ıce from their own Prophets as explain'd by their n Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of *Chriſt*.

G. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the « *uthority* of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the* « *lers or Phariſees believed in him? But this People,* « *o knoweth not the Law is curſed.* Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And « :y ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub.* « ıth. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in « s Caſe, the *People* or the *Church?* Upon the Foot « the *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at «

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People, and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

pon Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, iat has ſuch *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But nce the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, tell you once more that your Comparing the Dan-:r of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that : the *Jewiſh People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſen-:al, as it is Malicious.

In a Word, the Difference between the *Synago-e* and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *hurch in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is anifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to e it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit Truth ſhall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. 16. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of World*. Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was er made to the *Jewiſh Church*; on the Contrary her ›oſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was mani-ſtly foretold.

G. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſ- «
n of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the «
eſſias. For that they deny, and bid us prove it. «
iat is the whole Queſtion between them and us. «
ʒ. 45. 46. «

L. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging : Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evi-nce from their own Prophets as explain'd by their n Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of *Chriſt*.

G. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the «
uthority of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the* «
lers or Phariſees believed in him? But this People, «
o knoweth not the Law is curſed. Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And «
:y ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub.* «
ıth. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in «
s Caſe, the *People* or the *Church*? Upon the Foot «
the *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at «

the Authority of their Church in every Thing, wherein there was not *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But no Authority upon Earth can oblige any Man to a Thing, that is evidently unlawful. Now this was the Caſe in Relation to *Chriſt* and the *Jewiſh Church*. There appear'd in his ſacred Perſon all the *Marks* of the *true Meſſias* foretold by the ancient Prophets even as underſtood by their own Forefathers. Particularly thoſe relating to the *Time*, *Place*, and *Manner* of his *Birth*; the *Holineſs* of his Life; the *Purity* of his heavenly Doctrine; The *Death* he was to ſuffer through the Malice of his own People; and above all the ſtupendious *Miracles* wrought by him: The Evidence whereof was ſo ſtrong, that it could not be conteſted but by the blackeſt Malice. Here then there was an *unconteſtable Evidence* of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the Unlawfulneſs of Obeying that Authority, which condemn'd it. And till you can produce an Evidence as *unconteſtable* as this againſt the *Church of Rome*, a Parallel between her and the *Jewiſh Church* (which is the Thing you drive at) is all Froth and Nonſenſe. But whenever you produce an Evidence againſt her equal to this, I promiſe to become your Proſelite.

As for Inſtance, when you can ſhew me a *Reformer* of the Faith profeſs'd by the *Church of Rome*, that has been plainly foretold by the ancient *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* under the Character of a Perſon ſent by God: that has given *Sight* to the *Blind*, *Speech* to the *Dumb*, *Hearing* to the *Deaf*, *Health* to the *Sick*, and *Life* to the *Dead* in Teſtimony of the *Truth* of his Doctrine, and by Conſequence of the *Falſehood* of the Doctrine taught by the *Church of Rome*, I aſſure you, Sr, I will renounce that Church to embrace the *Reformation*. Becauſe no Authority

on Earth can oblige me to believe any Thing, it has ſuch *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it. But ce the very Reverſe of all this is manifeſtly true, ll you once more that your Comparing the Dan- of our Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome* with that the *Jewiſh People* to the *Synagogue* is as Nonſen- l, as it is Malicious.

n a Word, the Difference between the *Synago-* and the *Church* eſtabliſh'd by *Chriſt*, that is, the *rch in Communion with the Succeſſor of St Peter*, is nifeſt to any one, that will but open his Eyes to it. For whereas *Chriſt* has promiſed that *the Spirit Truth ſhall abide for ever with his Church*, Joh. 14. 6. And that *he will be with it even unto the End of World*. Math. 28. ℣. 20. No ſuch Promiſe was r made to the *Jewiſh Church*; on the Contrary her ſtacy at the Coming of the *Meſſias*, was mani- ly foretold.

. My Lord, it is perfectly Begging the Queſ- « of the *Jews* to ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* was the « *ſias*. For that they deny, and bid us prove it. « it is the whole Queſtion between them and us. « 45. 46. «

. Under Favour, Sr, Proving is not Begging Queſtion, and we prove it with the utmoſt Evi- ce from their own Prophets as explain'd by their Interpreters, and all verified in the Perſon of *Chriſt*.

. My Lord, the *Jews* anſwer all this by the « *hority* of the *Church*; which ſaid, *have any of the* « *rs or Phariſees believed in him? But this People*, « *knoweth not the Law is curſed*. Joh. 7. ℣. 34. And « ſaid that *Chriſt work'd his Miracles by Beelzebub*. « h. 12. ℣. 24. And who was to be the Judge in « Caſe, the *People* or the *Church*? Upon the Foot « he *Authority* of the *Church* is was impoſſible at «

» *G.* In the other *French Tranſlation* I mention'd
» before made for the Uſe of new Converts, this
» Expreſſion, 1. *Cor.* 3. ℣. 15. of ſome that ſhall be
» ſaved with great Difficulty, *as if paſſing through the*
» *Fire*, is boldly render'd *the Fire of Purgatory*, as
» the Words of the Text without any different Cha-
» racter, as is uſed with us, when a Word is put
» in to make *Engliſh* of an *Hebrew* or *Greek Idiom*.
» But in this *Louvanian* Tranſlation the Text is left
» ſtand, *ſo as by Fire*. Only *Purgatory* is put in the
» *Margin* in this Edition made ſince the Objections
» againſt the other Tranſlation; in which the Addi-
» tion of *Purgatory* to this Text is particularly taken
» Notice of. *pag.* 58.

L. Sr, I find then that the *Louvanian* Tranſlation is wholly blameleſs as to this Text: ſince it only explains it in the *Margin*; And that in the very ſame Senſe as St *Auſtin*, and many more of the ancient Fathers have done in their Writings. But, as to the other Tranſlation made for the *new Converts*, I refer you to my former Anſwer, viz. *it's being entirely ſuppreſs'd*. Which ſuffices abundantly to convince any Man of the Frivolouſneſs and Injuſtice of your Reproaching us with it. And let me tell you, Sr; if the Rulers of your Church were as honeſt and Sincere, as thoſe of ours, your *Engliſh Bible* would have undergone the ſame Fate a hundred and fifty Years ago.

» *G.* My Lord, I could give you more of the
» Corruptions of Texts in the *French* Tranſlations.
» I have now only named three. One of the *Sacri-*
» *fice* of the *Maſs*; another for the *Adoration* of the
» *Croſs* and *Images*, and one for *Purgatory*. pag. 58.

L. I doubt not, Sr, but you have pick'd out the moſt notorious ones; and 'tis a Sign you are but ill provided, ſince theſe are the choiceſt of your whole

ſtock. For I cannot think you are diſpoſed to favour me. But pray take Notice, Sr, that in the odious Subject, we are now upon, you have been the Aggreſſor. You cannot therefore take it ill, if I make Repriſals, when Occaſion ſhall ſerve. It ſeems your Conſcience is very ſqueamiſh as to ſome *unauthentick* Tranſlations of ours. You cry out, *Alas! What has the People gaind?* The leaſt *Gnat* choaks you. But, as to your own *Proteſtant* Tranſlation put forth, approved, and maintain'd by the whole Authority of your Church, you can ſwallow *Camels* without the leaſt *Alas*, or pious Groan to lament the Danger the People is in of being poiſon'd by it; as I ſhall ſhew hereafter, when we come to the Subject of *Communion in one Kind*, and the *ſingle Life of Prieſts*. In the mean Time I refer you for full Satisfaction to *the Church of Chriſt ſhew'd, &c.* 1. Part. Ch. 6. §. 7. Where you will find Reaſon enough to employ your zeal more uſefully in taking Care that your own People be not here ſeduced by falſe Tranſlations, than in Shewing ſo much Concern for your *Proteſtant* Brethren or new Converts abroad.

G. But the People are ſeduced by them. The « People believe as they are taught. There is ſmall « Security to them in the abſtruſe Queſtions con- « cerning *Infallibility*; how far it extends, and in the « Diſputes between *Popes* and *Councils* about it. Theſe « are Queſtions, of which I ſuppoſe your Lordship « will eaſily grant the common People are no Jud- « ges. They know nothing of the Matter. How ſhould « they, when the Learned are divided among them- « ſelves concerning them? *pag.* 59. «

L. Sr, the People underſtand nothing of the abſtruſe Queſtions concerning the *Bleſſed Trinity*, yet I hope they can believe it, when they are told they

muſt, without Underſtanding it. And ſo they can believe the *Church's Infallibility* without Underſtanding the Queſtions about it.

» *G.* However this *Infallibility*, if it could be found » and fix'd, would be of little Uſe to the Generality » of the People, unleſs their *Curates*, and their *Fa-* » *thers* and *Mothers*, who inſtruct them, were like- » wiſe all of them *infallible*. For, as I ſaid, they be- » lieve as they are taught, and examine no farther. » *pag.* 59.

L. Sr, if they be taught by, and follow an *infallible Guide*, I am ſure they will not err. And as long as Men, tho *fallible* themſelves; can, and do but faithfully deliver the Doctrine of an *infallible Church*, I am likewiſe very ſure, that even the moſt ignorant People, who ſuffer themſelves to be inſtructed by them, are in no Danger of being ſeduced. So that I am ſurpriſed at what you ſay, viz. *that this Infallibility, tho it could be found and fix'd* (as I ſhall ſhew hereafter it can) *would be of little Uſe to the Generality of the People, unleſs their Curates, and Fathers and Mothers, who inſtruct them, were likewiſe Infallible.* This, I ſay, ſurpriſes me, becauſe it follows from it, that the *Scriptures* themſelves, tho *Infallible* in what they teach, are *of little or no Uſe* to us, becauſe they, who read them are not *Infallible*.

§. 36.

Whether Infallibility *excludes Examination.*

» *G.* MY Lord, we ſuffer our People to ex- » mine. But yours are forbid to examine. » For that implies a *Doubt:* and they are not to doubt » of the Religion they are taught, but to receive » without any Doubt what has been told them by

the

e *Curate*, their *Fathers*, *Mothers*, and *Nurſes*, «
id what is current in the Country where they «
ve. This is all the *Infallibility*, of which they are «
pable. And this is the Way of all the Earth. «
: is thus that the Generality of Mankind, whe- «
ner *Heathens*, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, or *Chriſtians* re- «
ive their *Religion*. And without Examining into «
hat we have been taught no Man would change «
is Religion. None could ever have become a «
hriſtian, eſpecially a *Jew*, who had the *Authority* «
his *Church* againſt *Chriſt*, to which Church he al- «
dges Promiſes of *Perpetuity*, and *Infallibility*. pag. «
). 60. «

L. Sr, we shall never make an End, if I am bound repeat my Anſwers as often as you repeat your bjections. And therefore, as to what you ſay con-rning the Generality of Mankind chooſing their *eligion* by *Education*, I refer you to what I have ready ſaid to it (§. 28.) And, as to what you add oncerning the *Jews* alledging their *Promiſes* of *Per-tuity* and *Infallibility* againſt the *Authority* of *Chriſt*, have fully anſwer'd it. (§. 32.) All then I have ow to do is to conſider, *firſt*, what Truth there is n your Saying, that we forbid the People to exa-ine the Grounds of their Religion? And *2dly*, whe-her all ſuch Examination implies a *Doubt*?

As to the *firſt*, I aſſure you, Sr, there is nothing ve deſire more, than that every one, who is come o Maturity of Judgment, ſhould examine ſeriouſly he *Grounds* of his *Religion*: becauſe we are ſure there s nothing will contribute more to ſtrengthen them n the Faith they profeſs. What was it that kept St *uſtin* ſteddy in his Faith againſt all the crafty Rea-onings, and Allurements of the *Manichees*? Let us ear his own Words.

Not to ſpeak of that Wiſdom (ſays he) *which you do*

not believe is in the Catholick Church, there are many o
ther Things, which moſt juſtly keep me in her Communi
1. The Agreement of People and Nations holds me. 2. Au
thority begun with Miracles, nouriſh'd with Hope, en
creaſed by Charity, confirm'd by Antiquity holds me. 3.
ſucceſſion of Biſhops deſcending from the See of St Peter
to whom Chriſt after his Reſurrection committed his Flo
to the preſent Epiſcopacy holds me. Laſtly, *the very*
Name of Catholick holds me: of which this Church alone
has, not without Reaſon ſo kept the Poſſeſſion, that, tho
all Hereticks deſire to be call'd Catholicks, yet if a Stran
ger asks them, where Catholicks meet, none of the Here
ticks dares point out his own Houſe, or his own Church,
&c. Contra Epiſt. fund. C. 4.

Theſe were the Motives, that kept St *Auſtin* ſted-faſt and immoveable in the Faith he had embraced. And theſe Motives are ſo plain and intelligible, that every Man's private Reaſon is capable of Making a true Judgment of them. Therefore the more they are examined, provided it be done without Preju-dice or Paſſion, the more firmly they will fix thoſe who conſider them, in the Security they have in that *Religion*, which is founded upon them. And has not every *Roman Catholick* the very ſame Motives, that St *Auſtin* had to keep him ſtedfaſt in his Faith? Truly, Sr, 'tis no ſmall Comfort to us, that when we are queſtion'd about our Religion, we can anſwer for ourſelves Word for Word what St *Auſtin* ſaid to the *Manichees*, which no Member of any *reform'd Church* can do without Talking Nonſenſe.

Pray tell me, Sr, in what Nation under Heaven beyond the *Britiſh Dominions* has the Religion of the *Church of England* as diſtinguiſh'd from *Popery*, and the other *reform'd Churches*, ever been received? That Nation is not yet diſcover'd. You cannot therefore pretend to what St *Auſtin* calls *the Agreement of Peo-*

l Nations: Much leſs to the *Antiquity*, St *Auſtin* aks of. Since your Church or Religion is not yet o Years old.

2. What Evidence of *Miracles* can you ſhew, it may be a rational Inducement to any Man to lieve that the *Reformation* is of God, and has his al to it? On the Contrary you ridicule all *Mira-s*, becauſe you are conſcious to yourſelf, that you ve none to lay Claim to. Whereas our Religion s never planted in any Idolatrous Nation, but had doubted *Miracles* to vouch for the Truth of it.

3. How can the Name of *Catholick* belong to you, ce you have no *Univerſality* either of *Time* or *Place*, I have obſerved already, and ſhall ſhew more ly hereafter. (§. 54.)

4. How can your *Biſhops* and *Parſons* derive their ceſſion from the *Apoſtles*? Can you ſatisfy me in one Thing? *viz.* by whom your *firſt Proteſtant* ops were *ſent*, or who gave them their *Commiſſion* reach, and *adminiſter* the *Sacraments*? Was it *Secular Power*? That's Nonſenſe. For no Man can e that Power to another, which he has not him-. Were they the *Catholick Biſhops* their imme-te Predeceſſors? That's wholly incredibile. For t King was ever ſo Mad as to grant Commiſſions levy Forces againſt himſelf? And it would have n the ſame extravagant Madneſs in *Catholick Biſh-* to have commiſſion'd their immediate Succeſſors preach *Proteſtant* Doctrine, and cut the Throat of ir own Church. Add to this, that in the Reign of een *Elizabeth* the ancient *Catholick Biſhops* diſownd ir pretended *Biſhops* and *Parſons* as a ſpurious ce; and were violently deprived, and condemn'd Priſon or Banishment for refuſing to comply.

Nothing therefore can be more ridiculous than pretend to have a *Miſſion* from our Church: And

hence is follows plainly, that your firſt *pretended Biſhops* and their *inferiour Clergy* had no *Miſſion* from any Authority originally derived from the *Apoſtles*, and that, by Conſequence they *enter'd not by the Door into the Sheepfold, but as Thieves and Robbers.* Joh. 10. ℣. 1.

You have not therefore ſo much as any one of thoſe Marks of the *true Church*, or *Motives of Credibility*, (as *Divines* call them) which not only drew St *Auſtin* from *Hereſy*, but fix'd him immoveably in the *Catholick Church*. Whereas I defy you to ſhew that any one of theſe Marks is wanting to ours.

We have therefore no Reaſon to debarr our People from Examining the *Grounds* of their *Religion*. For it will ſtand the Teſt of the ſtricteſt Examination; and we only wish *Proteſtants* would examine impartially the Grounds both of their own Religion and ours. For if the Conſiderations of *Intereſt*, and Prejudices of Education were laid aſide, they would find *Antiquity*, *Catholicity*, *Miracles*, *Succeſſion*, and *Miſſion* derived from the *Apoſtles* on our Side, and not one of theſe Marks on theirs. Nay they would find the *Reformation*, whether conſider'd as to the *Motive* of it's *Beginning* (which was to ſatisfy the Luxury of a wicked, and arbitrary Prince) or the Means uſed for it's *Progreſs*, viz. *Violence*, *Sacrilege*, and *Plunder*; They would find it, I ſay, branded with ſuch Marks of Infamy confeſſed by their own Writers, as would convince them, that the *Holy Ghoſt* had no Part in ſuch Counſels. I will only add, that there is not a *Proteſtant* in the World, but if he traces the *Reformation* of the *Church*, whereof he is a Member, to it's Source, he will find, that either *Avarice*, *Ambition*, *Revenge*, or ſome other criminal Paſſion gave a Beginning to it.

'Tis therefore plain, we are not afraid to have the

Grounds of our *Religion* look'd into either by *Catholicks* or *Proteſtants*. Now let us conſider whether all Examination implies a *Doubt*. For my Part, I have often examined my Religion; yet I don't remember I ever doubted of it in my whole Life. But give me leave to ask you, Sr, whether you doubt of the *Scriptures?*

G. Not at all, My Lord.

L. Yet you examine and ſearch the *Scriptures*. And, by Conſequence all Examination do's not imply a *Doubt*. I ask again, whether the *Scriptures* be not *infallible* in what they teach?

G. I cannot deny it.

L. As therefore *infallible Scriptures* do not hinder us from Examining our *Education*, and how we came by our *Religion*, ſo neither do's an *infallible Church* barr any ſuch Examination. St *Paul* exhorted the *Theſſalonians* to *prove all Things*. 1. Theſ. 5. ℣. 21. But I hope he did not exhort them to doubt of all Things: that is, of all the Myſteries of Chriſtian Religion.

G. My Lord, when we diſcourſed of *private Judgment* (§. 33.) you required nothing leſs than an *entire Submiſſion* to the *Church*. Now I cannot comprehend how *Submitting* and *Examining* can be reconciled together. This looks ſomething like a Contradiction.

L. It will do ſo, if you remember but one Part of what I ſaid, and forget the other. For I diſtinguish'd then between the *Motives* of *Credibility*, which lead us to the true *Church* of *Chriſt*, and the *Myſteries* of *Faith*, which that Church declares to be *reveal'd Truths*. The *Motives* of *Credibility*, or *Marks* of the true *Church* of *Chriſt* are the proper Subject of our Examination. Nay we cannot examine them too ſeriouſly. For they are proportion'd to our Under-

ſtanding, and 'tis by this Examination we *prove all Things*, becauſe all depends upon it. But when by this Examination we have once found the true *Church* of *Chriſt*, we are then bound to *ſubmit* to her in every Thing: And nothing is more reaſonable than this *Submiſſion*. Becauſe nothing is more Conſonant to Reaſon than to ſubmit in Things, we do not underſtand, to that Authority, which God himſelf has eſtabliſh'd.

'Tis thus a wiſe Man acts in all temporal Concerns. If he has a Journey to go, and wants a *Guide*, he ſeeks out the beſt that is to be found, and then is wholly guided by him. If he be ſick, he enquires after the ableſt *Phyſician*. But when he has made his Choice, he ſuffers himſelf to be govern'd by his Preſcriptions. If he be engaged in a Law-ſuit his whole Enquiry is to find out the beſt *Lawyer* to manage it. But when he has found him, he is directed by him in every Thing.

And 'tis thus we muſt proceed in the great Concern of our eternal Salvation. God has *reveal'd* many Truths, and we are bound to believe them. But theſe Truths being *dark Myſteries*, and above our Comprehenſion, how muſt we know that God has reveal'd them? We muſt hear the *Church* of *Chriſt*, which being the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, 1. Tim. 3. *v.* 15. all *reveal'd* Truths are depoſited with her. But how muſt we know the *Church* of *Chriſt* from other *Heretical* Communions, which pretend to be that Church? We muſt know her by the *Marks*, I have already mention'd; which are ſo ſtrong and clear, that they render it *morally evident*, that the Church, they belong to, is that, with which God has depoſited all *Truth* according to the *Promiſes of Chriſt*. Now whoever has a *moral Evidence* that God has depoſited all Truth with this Church, lies under an

indiſpenſible Obligation to believe whatever she declares to be a *reveal'd Truth.* Becauſe, as a *moral Evidence* that God has *commanded* any Thing, obliges us to do it, ſo a moral Evidence, that God has *reveal'd* any Thing, obliges us to believe it. Nay a Man would act moſt unreaſonably, if he did otherwiſe. Becauſe Reaſon tells a Man, that he ought to believe every Thing, of the Truth whereof he has a *moral Evidence* or *Certainty*; which of it's own Nature excludes all rational Doubt or Fear of Falſehood. And thus it is, that Faith is always *rational*, tho the *Myſteries* we believe be above our Reaſon; and therefore cannot be ſcanned or ſearch't into by human Reaſon. Whence it alſo follows, that we always ſtand in Need of a *living Judge*, or *Viſible Guide* to direct us in the Way to Salvation; and *Chriſt* himſelf was this *living Judge*, whilſt he was upon earth.

§. 37.

The Neceſſity of a living Judge.

G. THis is *gratis dictum*, and Begging the Queſtion of the *Jews*, as I have already ſaid: who upon the *Authority* of their *Church* deny *Chriſt* to be the *Meſſias*. I will not repeat; only ask theſe few Queſtions ----- «

L. Hold, Sr, you ſay you will not repeat; and yet you do repeat. And 'tis now the third Time you tell me that I beg the Queſtion of the *Jews* in Saying that *Chriſt* was the *Meſſias*, and by Conſequence the *living Judge.* But under Favour, Sr, I have fully proved it. So let us hear your Queſtions.

G. I ask then *firſt*, who was the *living Judge* before the *Flood?* For you ſay there muſt be al-

» ways one, and ſo do's the Bishop of *Meaux*.
» 2. Was *Abraham* who was known only to a few
» Neighbours, and wrought no *Miracles* to convince
» others; was he, I ſay, given as ſuch a *Guide* or
» *Judge* to the whole Earth? And *Chriſt* was not ſo
» great a Traveller as *Abraham*. pag. 60.

L. It ſeems then it is your Opinion, that as *Abraham* was not ſufficiently known to be the *living Judge* to the whole Earth, ſo *Chriſt*, who was not ſo great a *Traveller* as *Abraham*, was ſtill leſs qualified for it. Really, Sr, I think you are too free with the ſacred Perſon of *Chriſt*; and your Obſervation of his not being ſo great a *Traveller* as *Abraham* is both frivolous and diſreſpectful. *Chriſt* came to preach the Goſpel to the *Jews* alone; and I preſume he made himſelf ſufficiently known to the *Jewiſh Church* to be their *Judge* of *Faith*. The Converſion of the *Gentiles* was reſerved for the *Apoſtles*, who founded that *Church*, which was to continue to the End of the World, and be govern'd (according to God's own Appointment) by their *Succeſſors* the Bishops united like them under one *Head*: Now theſe compoſe that Body, which to the World's End is to be that *living Judge of Faith*, concerning which the Diſpute preciſely is between *Proteſtants* and us. So that your Queſtions concerning the *living Judge* before the Flood, and in *Abraham's* Time are wholly out of the Way. This however we are ſure of, *viz.* that God always had a *true Church* upon Earth, that is, a Church viſibly profeſſing the *true Faith*: which was handed down throughout all Generations from *Adam* and his Children to *Noah*: from *Noah* to *Abraham*, and from *Abraham* to *Moſes*; who was the Founder of the *Jewiſh Church*, which in her *Prieſts* and *Prophets* was the *living Judge* of Faith, and Interpreter of the Law till the Coming of *Chriſt*. Now

ſince

ſince *Chriſtians* have likewiſe a *written Law*, which they regard as a Rule of their Faith, and this Law contains many ſublime Myſteries, about which there have been, and will be frequent Diſputes to the End of the World; how can theſe ever be determined, if there be not a *living Interpreter* veſted with full Authority to pronounce a definitive Sentence? 'Tis manifeſt, that ſince the *dead Letter* cannot ſpeak for itſelf, the Chriſtian Law without a *living Interpreter* can be no Rule of Chriſtian Faith.

Suppoſe there were a Nation, that ſhould give full Liberty to every one to interpret the *Law* by his own *private Judgment*: would it be poſſible in that Caſe either to condemn any Criminal, or put an End to any Law-ſuit? Nay would not Anarchy and Confuſion by the unavoidable Conſequence of it? The Matter is beyond all Diſpute. And therefore there is not a civiliz'd Nation in the World, but has a *ſupreme Tribunal* eſtabliſh'd, from which there is no Appeal. I only deſire you to apply this to the *Church of Chriſt*, and you will ſoon find the Neceſſity of a *living Judge* of Controverſy. If you have any Queſtions to ask concerning this Church, I am ready for you.

G. Pray, My Lord, where was the *living Judge* « when *Chriſt* was dead? And, if there was none for « three Days, it might be ſo for three or four hun- « dred Years, and for Good and all. Becauſe the Ar- « gument fails for the Neceſſity of a Judge always « in Being. You will not ſay the *Church of Chriſt* can « fail for three Days. The *Promiſes* of God can never « fail; no not for a Moment. *pag.* 60. 61. «

L. That's very right, Sr; I am glad to hear you ſpeak Truth ſometimes. God's Promiſes to his Church can never fail; no not for a Moment. Nay this is the very Foundation of her perpetual *Infalli-*

bility, againſt which *the Gates of Hell will never prevail.* But what do you infer from thence? You ask me, *who was the living Judge, when Chriſt was Dead?* I anſwer, there was none for thoſe three Days. For *Chriſt* was dead, and the *Apoſtles* had not yet received their *Commiſſion.*

G. Then, My Lord, it is falſe what you ſay, that there muſt always be a *living Judge.* And as I told you, if there was none for three Days, it might be ſo for three or four hundred Years, and ſo for good and all.

L. Moſt ſtoutly argued! But let us ſee, whether *Biſhops, Paſtors*, and the whole *Hierarchy* be not render'd uſeleſs, and a meer unneceſſary Lumber by the Force of this killing Argument. God preſerved his Church for three Days without *Biſhops*, or *Paſtors* to govern her. Therefore neither *Biſhops*, nor *Paſtors*, nor *Hierarchy*, nor *Government* are neceſſary for the *Church's* Preſervation. Whatever Anſwer you give to this trifling Argument, will fully anſwer yours. For either the Church fell at the Death of Chriſt, and that will ſhew the neceſſity of a *living Judge:* Since it could not ſubſiſt without one even for the ſhort Space of three Days. Or it did non fall, and then it is no more an Argument againſt the Neceſſity of a *living Judge*, than againſt the Neceſſity of *Biſhops* and *Paſtors* for it's Government. But I hope you will upon ſecond Thoughts find ſome Difference between *three Days*, and *three hundred Years or more.* However ſince you inſiſt with that Rigour upon the Word *always*, I muſt crave Leave to underſtand it *Morally*; which ſuffices to verify any Aſſertions of this Nature, unleſs Men are diſpoſed to be childiſhly ſcrupulous about the Matter.

§. 38.

The Church did not fail at the Death of Chriſt.

G. BUt will you then own, that the Church and Promiſes of God fail'd in thoſe three Days?

L. No, Sr, our Saviour's Promiſe of Infallibility to his Church neither did, nor could poſſibly fail at his Death, as not being then yet in Force; for a Promiſe cannot be broken before it is in Force; and the Promiſe we ſpeak of, was not to begin to be in Force till after the Coming of the *Holy Ghoſt*, the Author of it's Infallibility; as is expreſs'd in the very Words of the Promiſe. Her Infallibility is therefore dated from that Time forward: So, tho it were true that she fail'd at our Saviour's Death, this failure would be no Argument againſt her Infallibility after the Coming of the *Holy Ghoſt*, but only againſt her Infallibility before it. But I abſolutely deny, she fail'd even at that Time: prove it if you can.

G. Of the Apoſtles, one betray'd Chriſt: another forſwore him; and that was St *Peter*: All forſook him. *pag.* 61. «

L. This is a ſignal Mark of your great Reſpect for the Apoſtles in Treating them all alike as *Apoſtates*. But with your leave, Sr, I shall make a great Difference between *Judas* and the reſt, tho you make none. For as to that Traitor, I yield him up at Diſcretion. But as to St *Peter* (whom I ſuppoſe you ſpecify by Name for Honour ſake) and the other Apoſtles, I shall not part with them upon ſuch eaſy Terms. For their running away was the Effect only of a ſudden Fear, and not of any form'd Deſign to forſake their Maſ-

ter; as is manifeſt both in St *Peter* and St *John*, who after their Flight gave undeniable Proofs of their Continuing to adhere to him by returning immediately to him, and following him again. 'Tis true, St *Peter* deny'd him; but it was but for a Moment, and barely in Words: which he retracted the Moment after with Tears of the ſincereſt Repentance: and this ſhews it was not for Want of Faith but Courage to profeſs it, that he deny'd his Maſter. But St *John* follow'd him not only to his Trial but Execution, ſtood by his Croſs, and took our *Bleſſed Lady* to his Mother at his Recommendation; Which was not only Owning our Saviour, but a being own'd by him as a truſty *Diſciple* at the Time, that you are pleaſed to treat him as an *Apoſtate*. The reſt of the Apoſtles likewiſe retain'd ſtill the ſame Eſteem and Love for their Maſter, nor do's the Scripture accuſe them of any Error in Faith.

» *G.* Yes, My Lord, the greateſt that could be. » For *as yet they knew not the Scriptures, that he muſt* » *riſe again from the Dead.* Joh. 20. ℣. 9. *And if* » *Chriſt be not raiſed, your Faith is vain.* 1. Cor. 15. » ℣. 17. And the Reaſon given for chooſing *Mathias* » in the Room of *Judas* was *that he might be a Wit-* » *neſs with the other Apoſtles of the Reſurrection of Chriſt.* » Act. 1. ℣. 22. pag. 61.

L. As to your firſt Text, pray, Sr, is there no Difference betwixt an *inculpable Ignorance* of dark and unintelligible Scriptures, and the *Sin of Incredulity* after reveal'd Truths have been ſufficiently propoſed? This you charge the Apoſtles with, whereas the other was evidently their Caſe. For tho the Scriptures had foretold the Reſurrection of our Saviour, yet theſe Prophecys were ſo obſcure, that they could not be underſtood eſpecially by ignorant Men, much leſs oblige them to a *diſtinct Faith*, till

the Event had explain'd their Meaning. The Truth then of the Matter is, that the Apoſtles before they had been eye-witneſſes of our Saviour's Reſurrection neither believed nor disbelieved it. But it was to them as a Thing unthought of, and of which they had no Manner of Idea; the divine Wiſdom having thought fit to conceal theſe Myſteries, till their Accomplishment should make a clear Diſcovery of them.

Your Text from St *Paul* to the *Corinthians* is nothing to the Purpoſe. For the Apoſtle's Deſign in that Place is to eſtabliſh the future Reſurrection, which he proves from the Reſurrection of our Saviour; and this he proves from the abſurd Conſequences which would follow, *if Chriſt were not raiſed*: for then their Faith of it would be *falſe* and *vain*; and then they would be ſtill in their Sins which cannot be remitted without true Faith. But ſuppoſe he had told the *Corinthians* that their Believing in our Saviour would be *vain*, unleſs they believed his *Reſurrection*, this was true at the Time of his Writing that Epiſtle, when our Saviour's Reſurrection was become a neceſſary and principal Article of Faith; but it was not ſo at the Death of Chriſt, there being no Obligation to believe him riſen before he was. And thus you ſee, Sr, how wretchedly you have miſapplied this Text.

Your third Text from the *Acts* is trifled with in the ſame Manner by your applying that to the Time before our Saviour's Reſurrection, which relates only to the Time after it, when it was to be preach'd to the whole World.

G. Pray, My Lord, what Faith could they have « in him, whom they had quite given over, and « never expected to ſee more? *They truſted that it* « *had been he, who ſhould have redeem'd Iſrael?* Luke «

» 24. ℣. 21. But when he was dead, all their Hope
» was gone. They expected no Redemption from
» him. This was far from a *Chriſtian Faith*: and could
» there be a *Chriſtian Church* without this Faith?
» *pag.* 61.

L. This, Sr, is imputing the perſonal Defect of one or two to the whole Society; which is not only falſe Reaſoning, but great Injuſtice alſo. For the Text you have quoted, and on which you lay ſo great a Streſs, ſpeaks only of the two Diſciples of *Emaus*, who were neither the *whole Church*, nor the principal Members of it: and ſo it might have ſubſiſted, tho they had quite faln off from our Saviour; which yet is not true. For they continued to love him, as is plain from their Diſcourſing of him, and being *ſad* for what had happen'd to him; as alſo from his appearing to them to comfort them. 'Tis true, they knew not that Chriſt was to effect the *Redemption of Iſrael* by that very Means, which ſeem'd to hinder the Effecting of it, to wit, his Death. For they imagined he would have effected it during his Life; and being diſappointed of that Hope, they were at a Loſs what to think of it. But there is a great Deal of Difference betwixt a form'd Judgment againſt a Thing, and a Doubt or Uncertainty about it by Reaſon of it's Obſcurity; as there is likewiſe betwixt their abſolutely Deſpairing, and their being between Hope and Deſpair in the Trouble of their Mind for the Death of our Saviour, and Diſappointment of their preſent Hope. Which is the utmoſt import of the foremention'd Words.

» *G.* However, My Lord, to avoid the Force of
» this Objection and ſecure the Promiſe of Inde-
» fectibility to the Church ſome of your Authors of
» greateſt Name have ſaid that the Church was then
» preſerved in the *Virgin Mary*: and thence infer

at the *Catholick Church* may be preſerved in *one* «
oman as it was then. And ſo it may be again in «
ie Time of *Antichriſt* and the great Defection «
›retold before the ſecond Coming of Chriſt, when «
aith ſhall not be found upon Earth; that is, very «
ardly: when it may be confined to one *Laick*, or «
Voman, or a *baptiz'd Infant*. As *Bannez* (Com. in «
.. 2. Q. in Art. 10. dub. 1.) and others of your «
)octors allow. They are no leſs Men than *Alenſis* «
he Author of the *Gloſs* upon the *Decretals*. *Lyra*, «
)ccham, *Aliaco*, *Panormitan*, *Turrecremata*, *Peter* «
e Monte, St *Antoninus*, *Cuſanus*, *Clemangis*, *Jaco-* «
etius, J. *Fr. Picus*, *&c.* and to ſave Repetition, «
our *Lordſhip* will find their Books and Words «
noted in a ſmall Treatiſe entitled, *the incurable* «
cepticiſm of the Church of Rome printed here Ann. «
588. p. 22. &c. I name this little Tract, becauſe «
is ſhort, and will give your *Lordſhip* no great «
rouble: and proceeds upon the ſame Argument «
have undertaken with your *Lordſhip* inſtead of «
ie particular Points in Diſpute betwixt the *Church* «
Rome and us: as *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, «
c. to go at once to the Bottom of the Cauſe, «
id examine the Ground and Foundation of Faith «
taught by the *Church of Rome:* which is ſhew'd, «
think, to a Demonſtration to be wholly preca- «
ous, and uncertain; and that there is no greater «
ifference and Confuſion among any Sort of «
len upon any Subject whatſoever, than there «
among the Divines of the *Church of Rome* con- «
rning her *Rule of Faith*, and *Infallible Judge of* «
ntroverſy. And every one of the different O- «
nions about it is in flat Contradiction to all «
ie others. So that if any one of them be true, «
l the reſt muſt be falſe. Yet they all pretend «
believe with *divine Faith*, and think » it neceſ- «

» ſary in this Caſe, becauſe it is the Foundation of » their Faith.

» Now if according to theſe learned Doctors the » whole Church fail'd upon our Saviour's Death, » then *the Gates of Hell did prevail for a Time.* And » if the *Virgin Mary* were exempted, that would » not do much as to the ſtanding of the Church. But » have they any Revelation to ground divine Faith » upon? Or upon what Grounds do they believe » that the *Virgin Mary* knew the *Scriptures*, or the » *Reſurrection of Chriſt* more than the *Apoſtles*, and » was not under the ſame *Deſpondency* as they were? » This ſeems to be that Sword; which *Simeon* told » her *ſhould Pierce through her own Soul alſo.* Luke 2. » ℣. 35. pag. 62. 63.

L. Sr, you have here impannell'd a jury of 11. *Catholick Divines* againſt me, who (as you tell me) maintain, that at the Death of Chriſt the Church was preſerved in the *Virgin Mary*, and may, for ought they knew, be reduced to a *ſingle Woman*, or *Laick*, or *baptiz'd Infant* before the *ſecond Coming* of Chriſt. But I doubt very much, whether thoſe Divines ever maintain'd either of theſe Opinions; and a very good Reaſon of my Doubt is, the little Credit, that is to be given to your Voucher, the Author of the *incurable Scepticiſm*, which you magnify into a Demonſtrative Piece againſt us; whereas it proves but one Thing to a Demonſtration; to wit, that the Author of it is a notorious Miſrepreſenter and Falſifier of our Divines. For the Truth whereof I refer you to the *Appendix* of *the true Church of Chriſt ſhew'd, &c.* from pag. 455. to pag. 476. where you will find enough to convince you how little your unanſwerable Author is to be depended upon in his Quotations.

» But ſuppoſe theſe Divines had really taught what

is

is imputed to them by that Author relating to the Points in Queſtion, I have no Obligation to follow them in particular Opinions, which appear contrary both to Reaſon and clear Facts. You tell me, that to avoid the Force of your Objection they ſaid the Church was at the Death of Chriſt preſerved in the *Virgin Mary*. They allow then that it was *preſerved*, contrary to your Opinion. But I ſee no Manner of Neceſſity of their being reduced to that Anſwer: becauſe there were others enough beſides the *bleſſed Virgin* to uphold the Church. For, to ſay nothing of the many *Samaritans*, who believed in *Chriſt*, Joh. 4. ℣. 39. or of many of the Multitude, who alſo believed in him, *Joh.* 7. ℣. 31. what do you find in *Scripture* againſt *Lazarus*, the *blind Man* of the Temple, *Joſeph of Arimathea*, *Nicodemus*, *Zacheus*, St *Mary Magdalene*, and other pious Women? Is it credible that *Lazarus* could ſo ſoon doubt of that Power, which but a few Days before had raiſed him out of the Grave; or that he was leſs devoted to Chriſt after that ſtupendious Miracle wrought in Favour of him than before? What Reaſon can you invent to ſuſpect the *blind Man*, who ſtood up ſo boldly in Defence of him againſt the whole *Jewiſh Council* at a Time, when they were reſolved to make an Example of any that ſhould declare for him? For if he ſtood up ſo couragiouſly for our Saviour, before he did him the ſpecial Favour to reveal his *Divinity* to him, how much more firm muſt he have been to him after that? Nay ſo far was our Saviour from being forſaken by all at his Death, that there were ſome, who ſtuck to him then more openly than ever. *Joſeph of Arimathea*, who before was but his Diſciple in private for Fear of the *Jews*, was now bare-faced for him, and went boldly to beg his Body, which he and *Nicodemus* embalm'd, wrapt up

in clean Linnen, and laid in a *Virgin-tomb*, venturing every Thing to give him an honourable Burial. St *Mary Magdalene* and other holy Women were remarkable for their Devotion to him not only before but after his Death: witneſs their ſtanding by him, whilſt he hung on the Croſs; their Mourning at his Sepulchre; their Preparing their Perfumes the Evening of the Saboth; their going early the next Morning to embalm his Body, and their other pious Offices, which were the Effects of their *Faith* in him. All theſe, I think are Proofs enough that the Church was far either from Failing, or being reduced to a ſingle Perſon at the *Death of Chriſt*. And that she will not fail before his *ſecond Coming* I have fully proved already. *Firſt*, from this plain Promiſe of Chriſt, *that he will be with her even unto the End of the World*. Math. 28 ℣. 20. and Chriſt cannot be with a Church, that has no Being. So that when the World Ends, then indeed the Church will End, and not before. *2dly*, becauſe the Church will be perſecuted by *Antichriſt*; and she cannot be perſecuted, unleſs she has a viſible Being. *3ly*, becauſe the *Elect* will not be ſeduced by him; and ſurely the *Elect* will not diſſemble their *Faith*, but profeſs it openly. *4ly*, becauſe *Enoch* and *Eliah* will appear viſibly upon Earth, and maintain the true Faith againſt the wicked *Antichriſt*: and *5ly*, becauſe the *Jews* will be converted, and brought into the *Fold of Chriſt* not long before the End of the World; and theſe will not be converted by *inviſible Paſtors*, but by Men openly Profeſſing and Preaching the true *Faith of Chriſt*. And is all this conſiſtent with your ſaying and Repeating it ſo often as you do, that *there will be no Faith upon Earth at Chriſt's ſecond Coming?*

But, to return to the chief point under Debate, you are not content to treat the *Church* as

a *Deſertreſs* of *Chriſt* at his Death, and his *Apoſtles* as *Apoſtates*, but have the Boldneſs even to attack the *Mother of God*. For you not only queſtion her *Faith*, but even argue ſeriouſly againſt it. You ask me *what Revelation we have*, that she was not guilty of *Unbelief* and *Deſpondency*? But it is you, who are to be ask'd what *Revelation* you have to prove that she was guilty of that Fault? It being not only againſt Decency but common Juſtice to impeach her *Faith* upon the bare Want of a poſitive *Revelation* for it. You may as well accuſe the *Apoſtles* of having been *high-way Men*, becauſe there is no poſitive Text which ſays the contrary. Nay 'tis a crying Injuſtice to accuſe the meaneſt Perſon upon Earth of any Crime without a poſitive Proof of it: but it is not barely Injuſtice, but downright impiety to charge the *ſacred Mother of God* with the Crime of *Apoſtacy* from her *Faith* in *Chriſt* upon a bare negative Argument, which would be of no Weight againſt the vileſt of Creatures.

But, Sr, to give you full Satisfaction, there is even *Revelation* enough to acquit her. For has it not been reveal'd to us, that she was aſſured even by an *Archangel*, that the *bleſſed Fruit* she was to bear, ſhould be *the Son of the moſt high*, *the Saviour of his People*, and the *Poſſeſſor of a Kingdom that ſhould never end*? Has it not been reveal'd to us, that she not only received this heavenly Meſſage, but *believed* it, and was declared happy for *believing* it? And would you then have us think, that she who believed this Myſtery upon the Word of the *Angel* before it was wrought in her, could ever doubt of it after her *miraculous Conception*, and undoubted Experience of it's Truth? Has it not likewiſe been reveal'd to us, that she had the ſame Divine Aſſurance again from St *Elizabeth's* Saluting her as *the Mother of the Lord*

and admiring not only her Goodneſs in Honouring her with a Viſit, but alſo her *Faith?* Luke 1. ℣. 41. 43. 44. 45. And could ſuch a Mother doubt of ſuch a Son, who had been promiſed her by an *Angel* from Heaven; whom she knew she had *conceived* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; whom the *Shepherds* ſent by *Angels*, and the *Kings* conducted by a *Star* had adored in her Preſence, and whom *Simeon* and *Anna* had by Divine Inſtinct proclaim'd *the Saviour of Iſrael* in her Hearing? Have we not here *Scriptures* and *Revelation* enough to convince any Chriſtian of the moral Impoſſibility of her entertaining the leaſt Doubt of the *Divinity* of her *Son*, even amidſt the moſt ſhocking Circumſtances of his Sufferings and Death? The deep Senſe whereof pierced indeed her tender Soul with the moſt ſenſible Grief, and was truly that *Sword* foretold by *Simeon*; whoſe Prediction you have turn'd to her Diſhonour by a no leſs ſcandalous than ſenſeleſs Interpretation of it; as I leave any one to Judge, who pretends to know any Thing of Scriptures.

Thus, Sr, you have undertaken three noble Exploits, which cannot but redound very much to the Honour of your Cauſe; *viz.* to make the *Apoſtles* falſe to their *Maſter*, the *Mother of God* falſe to her *Son*, and *Chriſt* himſelf falſe to his *Word* by your Declaring *that the Gates of Hell prevail'd for a Time* againſt his Church; which is declaring peremptorily, that the *Contradictory* to his Word was true at that Time.

G. My Lord, you are too sharp upon me. For I pretend not to diſpute againſt *Chriſt*, or his *Church*; but only againſt your pretended *Popiſh Infallibility*.

L. Pardon me, Sr. For our *pretended popiſh Infallibility*, as you call it, is wholly unconcern'd in what happen'd at the *Death of Chriſt*. Becauſe the

Holy Goſt was not then come down upon the *Apoſtles*. And the Queſtion concerning the *Church's Infallibility* (as I have already told you) is not whether she was infallible before she had the promiſed Aſſiſtance of the *Divine Spirit to lead her into all Truth*, but whether she has been a fallible or infallible Church ſince her Eſtabliſhment upon the Foot of the Promiſes? So that whatever happen'd before, is wholly foreign to the main Queſtion: and it follows from it, that all you have attack'd, tho, God be praiſed, with vain Efforts, is the *Infant-Church* of Chriſt, the *Mother* of Chriſt, and the *Veracity* of his ſacred Promiſes.

As to what you have ſaid concerning the pretended *Difference* and *Confuſion* in our Church about our *Rule of Faith*, and *Judge of Controverſy*, when you give yourſelf the Trouble to prove it, which I preſume you will endeavour to do hereafter, I ſhall be ready to give you the beſt Satisfaction I can. But as at preſent you barely affirm it without any Proof, ſo I deny it without any farther Anſwer. If you have any Thing more to ſay relating to our preſent Subject, you ſhall have a fair Hearing.

G. My Lord, I ſhall propoſe a ſhort *Dilemna* to you.

L. I own, that is a cut-throat Sort of Argument; however let us have it.

G. If the *Chriſtian Church* was not form'd, as « ſome think, till after the *Reſurrection*, becauſe our « Redemption was not till then completed: or as « others think till the *Aſcenſion*, when Chriſt com- « miſſion'd his Apoſtles to go and teach all Nations: « or till the Deſcent of the *Holy Ghoſt*, when they « were *endued with Power on high*, Luke 24. ℣. 49. « Yet any of theſe Ways it will follow, that there « was no *Chriſtian Church* before the Death of Chriſt, «

» and then that the *Jewish Church* was the only true » Church, whilſt Chriſt lived in the World. For » the *Jewish Church* was to laſt, till the *Chriſtian* was » form'd; elſe there was no Church at all after Chriſt » came till his *Reſurrection*. And then it will follow, » that the only true Church in the World did re- » ject Chriſt. And then there will be no Choice left » us but either to acknowledge the *Fallibility* of the » Church, or to reject Chriſt from being the *Meſ-* » *ſias*. But if the *Chriſtian Church* was form'd upon » the firſt Appearance of Chriſt in the World, or » upon his Ordaining the 12 Apoſtles, and ſending » them out to preach, or upon any other Act done » in his Life, then (as I ſaid before) the whole » Church fail'd upon his Death. *pag.* 64. 65.

L. Sr, your *Dilemma* is a very harmleſs one; and I anſwer you directly, that the *Chriſtian Church* was form'd long before our Saviour's Paſſion. That is, as ſoon as there was a *viſible Society* of Men believing in *Chriſt*. But I deny your Conſequence, viz. *that then the whole Church fail'd at his Death:* as indeed you ſaid before; but I have already both ſaid and proved the contrary ſo fully, that there needs no farther Anſwer to it. Now then you may go on.

§. 39.

The Queſtion concerning the Neceſſity of a living Judge *reſumed.*

» *G.* IF the Church cannot fail, no not for a Mo- » ment, becauſe of the Neceſſity of *a living* » *Infallible Judge* always in Being, the Succeſſion of » the *Monarchy* of the Church ought to be *hereditary*, » where the King never dies. For this Scheme will » not admit of an *Interregnum* for Months and Years,

that may be ſpent in the Election of a Pope, all « which Time the Church has no *Head* or *Monarch*. « Much leſs when there are *Popes* and *Antipopes*, « which has occaſion'd 26 Schiſms in the *Church of* « *Rome*, ſome of them of a long Continuance. And « who is Judge in ſuch a Caſe? Is every Man left « to his *private Judgment?* And is it all one which of « the contending Popes he adheres to? Whether « to the right or wrong? Or can the *Church* have « two or three oppoſit Heads at the ſame Time? « *pag.* 65. «

L. No, Sr. But she may be without a miniſterial Head for ſome Time; as when the Pope dies. Nor do's she then ceaſe to be the *living Infallible Judge* of Faith: becauſe her Infaillibility is derived from Chriſt himſelf, who never dies, nor ever leaves her for a Moment, but will according to his Promiſe be with her *even unto the End of the World*. And therefore whilſt her viſible Head is either Dead, or the Legality of his Title diſputed, she continues veſted with full Power to take ſuch Meaſures as are neceſſary either to terminate Diſputes, that may occur about doctrinal Points, or remove all Uncertainties relating to the due Election of her ſupreme Paſtor. And ſo, Sr, with your good Leave there will be no Occaſion of leaving every Man to his own *private Judgment*, nor will there be any Danger of Inconveniences from the short *Vacances*, or *Interregnums*, as you call them, betwixt the Pope's Death, and a new Election.

As to the ſeveral *Schiſms* you have number'd up, I know but one, wherein the true Pope could be queſtion'd with any Colour of Reaſon; I mean the great Weſtern Schiſm, which I preſume you chiefly ſpeak of. But I cannot imagine what Argument you can draw from it againſt the Neceſſity of a li-

ving Judge always in Being. For, tho the Pope was doubtful during thoſe Troubles, the *Church of Chriſt* was not doubtful; but ſhew'd herſelf to be a *living Judge* to all Intents and Purpoſes by Aſſembling a *general Council*, and taking the moſt vigorous Meaſures to terminate the *Schiſm*.

» *G.* I told your *Lordſhip* before, there never » was a Council truly *general*: and that there are » Diſputes in your Church concerning *general Coun-* » *cils*, ſome receiving thoſe, or Part of them, which » others reject. And who ſhall be the Judge in this » Caſe? *pag.* 65.

L. Sr, as all this has been ſaid before, ſo has it alſo been anſwer'd before.

» *G.* But ſuppoſe you were agree'd among your- » ſelves concerning Councils, and that they were » *Infallible*, yet they are not a *living Judge always in* » *Being*. You have not had one ſince that of *Trent*, » which began Ann. 1545. and was concluded Ann. » 1563. now 150 Years ago. And there may not be » another in twice that Time, if ever. Where then » is the *living Judge always in Being*, which the Biſh- » op of *Meaux* and others thinks neceſſary? *pag.* » 65. 66.

L. I dare ſwear, Sr, neither the Bishop of *Meaux*, nor any Man in his Senſes ever meant, that a *general Council* muſt be always in Being. It is an extraordinary Tribunal aſſembled upon extraordinary Occaſions: but the other Tribunals ſuffice for ordinary ones; eſpecially that of the *principal* and *ſupreme Church* of *Rome*, by whoſe Authority numberleſs Hereſies have been ſuppreſs'd without any general Council. For whenever the Pope pronounces *Juridically*, or *ex Cathedra* (as Divines call it) upon any *Doctrinal* Point, his Sentence being received by the *diffuſive Body* of the *Church* is an *unerring Rule* of *Faith*.

'Twas

'Twas thus the *Pelagian Hereſy* was condemn'd, firſt by the Bishops of *Africa*, and upon their Requeſt by *Innocent* the *firſt*: And by *Zoſimus* in his circular Letter to all Bishops, who received his Judgment. Upon which St *Auſtin* ſaid, *jam finita cauſa eſt*; the Controverſy is now ended. This, Sr, is that *ſtanding Tribunal*, or *living Judge*, for which you ſeem to be ſo much in Pain. But me thinks, Sr, even paſt *general Councils* may not improperly be call'd *Living*, that is, *always in Being*, becauſe their *Canons* are ſo, and determine all Controverſies at leaſt between *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants*. And if Neceſſity requires it, new Councils may be call'd.

G. And Ages may paſs before that can be done. « And the *Church* may be corrupted in the mean « Time for Want of ſuch a *living Judge*. pag. 66. «

L. Sr, you need not be ſolicitous about that Matter. For the *diffuſive Body* of the *Church* is always in *Being*, and will take effectual Care to keep out any *Hereſy*, tho her *ſupreme Paſtor* should not think fit to call a *general Council*.

G. As *Europe* is now ſituated, it would be pret- « ty difficult to have a *general Council*. And it may « be long enough before any *Pope* may be of Opi- « nion to call one, and hazard his *Supremacy* upon « it. *pag.* 66. «

L. Sr, I never read of a *general Council*, that ever offer'd to prejudice, or call in Queſtion the Pope's *Supremacy*.

§. 40.

The depoſing Power.

G. BUt, My Lord, the *Canons* of paſt Councils « are not *living*, nor can ſpeak for them- « ſelves. There are Volumes printed of the Lear- «

» ned in your own Communion giving contrary Ex-
» poſitions of the *Canons*. I will inſtance in one,
» the 3d *Canon* of the 4th, commonly call'd, the
» *great Lateran Council*, acknowledg'd to be a true
» *general Council* by all of the *Church of Rome*, eſta-
» bliſh'd in moſt expreſs and poſitive Terms the
» Pope's Power of *Depoſing* Princes, and abſolving
» their Subjects from their Allegiance, not only if
» he pleaſe to call them *Hereticks* themſelves, but if
» they do not extirpate all *Hereticks* out of their
» Dominions. This is maintain'd in the literal Senſe
» by *Bellarmin*, and the *Italian* Doctors. On the o-
» ther Hand the *Gallican Church*, who have condemn'd
» the *depoſing* Doctrine, and yet own this *Council* of
» *Lateran*, are put to hard Shifts, and many Diſ-
» tinctions to ſolve this. But it is impoſſible. For
» either that Doctrine muſt be true, or this Coun-
» cil has greatly err'd. *pag.* 66. 67.

L. Sr, under Favour, neither the one nor the o-ther. For you Miſtake the Senſe of the *Canon* you ſpeak of; and therefore whether the *Depoſing* Doctrine relating to the *Pope* be true or falſe, the *Council* did not err.

G. That's very ſtrange, *My Lord*. But I ſhould be glad to know, what Senſe that *Canon* will bear, if it do's not give the Pope full Power to depoſe *heretical* Princes, and abſolve their Subjects from their Allegiance.

L. Sr, the third *Canon* of the *Lateran Council* contains no doctrinal Point of *Faith*, but the whole Subject of it is a meer Regulation of *Diſcipline* relating to the Methods that were to be obſerved during the *holy War* againſt the *Turks*. And the chief Import or Deſign of it was to provide an effectual Expedient for the Suppreſſing of the *Albigenſes*, who were become open *Rebels* both againſt the *Church* and *State*

and to hinder them and others from taking an Advantage of the Abſence of their neighbouring *Catholick Princes*, and invading their Dominions, whilſt both their Perſons and Troops were employ'd in that holy Cauſe. However nothing was done without the Conſent of all the *crown'd Heads*, that were concern'd in the Matter. For they all had their Embaſſadors at the Council, and not one of them oppoſed the *Canon*, or made any Objection againſt it. Which is an unanſwerable Proof, that they did not look upon it as any ways prejudicial to the juſt Rights and Prerogatives of their reſpective Sovereigns.

G. But *Bellarmin*, and your *Italian Divines* are of a contrary Opinion, and build their *depoſing Doctrine* upon the Authority of that *Canon*.

L. They do ſo. But *for one Catholick Divine, that is of their Opinion, there are forty againſt it: And for one Catholick that believes it, there are a thouſand that believe nothing of it* [*Caſe review'd.* pag. 57. 1. Edit.] Nay if any Subject of a Catholick *Sovereign* Prince on this Side of the *Alps* ſhould venture to maintain it, he would paſs his Time but very uncomfortably.

G. This, My Lord, is at leaſt an undeniable Inſtance, that the *Canons* of paſt *Councils* are not *Living*, nor can ſpeak for themſelves. And (as I told you juſt now) there are Volumes printed of the learned in your Communion giving contrary Expoſitions of the *Canons*.

L. Sr, I grant there are ſome few *Canons*, the ſenſe whereof is diſputed among *Divines*; and theſe cannot ſpeak for themſelves, nor are they any *Rules of Faith*. So that till the Senſe of them be determined either by another *General Council*, or the unanimous Agreement of the *diffuſive Body* of the *Church*, every Body is free to take what Side he pleaſes without Danger of *Hereſy*, or Breach of Communion

with the *See* of *Rome*. However the greateſt Part of the *Canons* ſpeak ſo very plainly, that they interpret themſelves to any Man of common Senſe. Nay I believe you think they ſpeak but too plainly. For they are all on the *Popiſh* Side. But let that be as it will, the *third Canon* of the *Lateran Council*, about which you make ſuch a heavy Splutter, contains no Matter of *Faith*.

» *G.* But is it not Matter of *Salvation*, for which » we ſhall be Judg'd at the laſt Day? St *Paul* ſays » *Rom.* 13. ℣. 2. *They, that reſiſt* (Lawful) *Powers,* » *ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation* ----- *Wherefore* » (ſays he ℣. 5.) *ye muſt needs be Subject not only for* » *Wrath* (or Fear of temporal Punishment from » theſe Powers) *but alſo for Conſcience-ſake*; that is, » towards *God*. And what are theſe Guides of Con- » ſcience, who lead us wrong in this? In the De- » ſcription of the *laſt Judgment* given by *Chriſt*, Math. » 25. ℣. 31. &c. Men ſhall be judged chiefly for their » Practice. There is nothing mention'd there but » what Men have done. And have we no *Guides* as » to *Practice*, while we raiſe ſuch Contentions about » a *Guide* in *Faith?* Or is not the *Church* a Guide in » Practice too? And is not a *General Council* the » *Church?* Then the Church has led us into a dam- » nable Practice, unleſs the *Pope* has Power to *de-* » *poſe* Princes at his Pleaſure, and that there is no » Sin in *Rebellion*, and all the *Blood* and *Deſolation*, » that follows it, if his *Holineſs* ſo commands. *pag.* » 67. 68.

L. Believe me, Sr, *Rebellion* is a moſt grievous and damnable Sin, and the Authors of it are accountable for all the *Blood*, and *Deſolation*, that follows it, let him command it that will. But, Sr, if all *Depoſing* be *Rebelling*, I know what I know. However let it ſuffice for the preſent, that you may be a very

od *Roman Catholick* without ſubſcribing to the *de-ſing Doctrine.*

G. And may not I be as good a *Roman Catho-* «
k, if I do *believe* it, and *defend* it, and *practiſe* it «
o? *pag.* 68. «

L. And may not I be a very good *Proteſtant*, if I *lieve* the *People's depoſing Power*, and *defend* it, and *actiſe* it too?

G. Have I not all the Encouragement, the *Church* «
Rome can give me? The frequent practice of «
opes themſelves, and here the *Canon* of a *general* «
ouncil for it? And have any of the *Popes* ever re- «
ounced it? *pag.* 68. «

L. And have not I all the Encouragement, the hole Body of *reform'd Churches* in the World can ive me, and the Authority of all the *reforming A-oſtles* into the Bargain, who not only taught, but ractiſed the *depoſing Doctrine*, and ſome died *Mar-yrs* in the Cauſe, only Shifting the Queſtion from he *Pope* to the *People?* Either therefore *Depoſing* and *Rebelling* are not the ſame; or, if they be, all your Railing at the *Pope*, and *Church of Rome* upon that Account is but Lampooning the *Reformation*, and making Satyrs upon your own Church. As to the *Canon*, you ſpeak of, I have already told you, it Admits of various Interpretations.

G. Then your *Lordſhip* ſees that *Canons* are but a «
dead Letter, and that there may be Diſputes about «
hem. And where then is the *living infallible Judge* «
lways in Being? *pag.* 68. «

L. I told you, Sr, juſt now. But greats Wits have bad Memories.

G. You ſee the *Canons* of paſt *Councils* cannot be «
his *Judge*, there muſt be another Judge to deter- «
mine their true Senſe. *pag.* 68. «

L. The very ſame, Sr, as determines the true Senſe of *Scriptures.*

» *G.* And who ſhould that Judge be but the *Pope* » the *Head* of the *Church?* I am ſure, if I were a » *Roman Catholick*, I ſhould be on that Side. *pag.* » 68.

L. The Pope, Sr, is very much obliged to you for your good Inclinations towards him. However I preſume he will not be leſs *Infallible*, if the *diffuſive Body* of the *Church*, or a *general Council* (when he thinks fit to call one) be join'd with him.

» *G.* I could ſhew your *Lordſhip* ſeveral other » *Canons* of *Councils*, that are in Diſpute among your » Doctors. But what Wonder is it, when I have » already ſhew'd, that they are in Diſpute about » *Councils* themſelves. It follows however that there » is *no Certainty*, what the Judgment of your Church » is. Or rather it is certain, that it is moſt *erroneous*; » and in Matters that concern eternal Salvation, as » well as the Peace of the World, that is, *Rebellion* » amongſt other Things, which is as *Witchcraft* and » *Idolatry*. pag. 68. 69.

L. What, Sr! Is her Judgment *certainly* erroneous; tho there be *no Certainty* of what her Judgment is! That's very hard indeed. But you need not be in Pain about the Judgment of the *Roman Catholick Church* concerning the *depoſing Doctrine.* For 'tis certainly her Judgment, that it is no *Article of Faith*, and may therefore be either held or rejected without Danger of *Hereſy.* Nay it is generally rejected, as I have already told you. So that you may beſtow your *Witchcraft* and *Idolatry* upon what Church you pleaſe. For the *Church* of *Rome* has nothing to do with them.

» *G.* My Lord, I have inſtanced in this Sin, be-

I know your *Lordſhip* is tenacious of your « lty. *pag. 69.* «

Sr, I am obliged to you for your good Opi- of me, and I hope I ſhall always deſerve it.

And now, My Lord, ſince the ſaving of our « is the End for our being in any Church, I « your *Lordſhip* to Judge whether the People « ıfeſt in the *Communion* of *Rome*, or in the « *h of England* as to this Point. *pag. 69.* «

Sr, to prevent all Equivocation in my Anſwer, *:poſing Doctrine* may be conſider'd either relati- to the *Pope alone*, or as it regards all Sorts of ns indifferently: that is, preciſely as it is Juſ- e or Unjuſtifiable in the *Court of Conſcience*. If onſider it with Relation to the *Pope alone*, then iſpute is not whether *Depoſing* Princes be *Law- Unlawful*, but whether the Power of doing it to be acknowledg'd in the *Pope*: which re- it to a meer *political* Controverſy, and the ng or not Holding it makes no more Diffe- as to the *Safety of Salvation* than maintaining ıry Opinions about a Point of Law. So that, a *Proteſtant Government* (which denies the *Po- poſing Power* as all *Proteſtants* do) may indeed a *political* Advantage over that of a *Catholick m*, which allows it; yet the *Church* on either s wholly unconcern'd in the Queſtion thus

I preſume, Sr, our Diſpute is not about what ſt in *Politicks*, but what is ſafe in *Conſcience*: rou have poſitively declared the *depoſing Doc-* ɔ be inconſiſtent with Salvation, and contrary expreſs Doctrine of St *Paul*. Nay you have 'd it with the Crimes of *Rebellion*, *Witchcraft*, *lolatry*. Leaſt therefore I should miſtake your ng, give me leave to propoſe ſome Queſtions

to you. Is the *depoſing Doctrine* inconſiſtent with Sal*vation*, only as it regards the *Pope?* Again, when St *Paul* ſays, that *they who reſiſt Powers ſhall receive Damnation to themſelves* (which is the very Text you have quoted) do's he only ſpeak of *Popes?* Finally, when you told me that *Depoſing* is the Sin of *Rebellion*, which is as *Witchcraft* and *Idolatry*, did you mean, that it is a Sin of this hainous Nature, only when it is commanded or authoriz'd by the *Pope?* Pray, Sr, anſwer me theſe Queſtions.

G. My Lord, it is plain my Meaning is, that depoſing a Lawful Prince is a moſt grievous Sin, let him command or practiſe it that will.

L. I confeſs, Sr, I took this to be your Meaning; becauſe I could not eaſily comprehend how a Man of your Wiſdom should maintain that Depoſing is *inconſiſtent with Salvation*, and contrary to the *Word of God*, nay ſtigmatize it with the odious Names of *Rebellion*, *Witchcraft*, and *Idolatry*, unleſs you regarded it as a moſt grievous Sin in it's own Nature, that is, independently of the Character or Religion of the Perſons concern'd in it. So that, whether it be practiſed by *Proteſtants* or *Papiſts*, by the *Pope*, or by *Proteſtant Biſhops*, the Sin is the ſame. For tho (as I have already obſerved) there may be very good *politick Reaſons* for Diſallowing a depoſing Power in a *foreign Prince*, which perhaps will not hold with equal Force in Relation to the *natural Subjects* of any Sovereign, yet *Reaſons of Conſcience*, ſuch as it's being inconſiſtent with Salvation, and contrary to the Word of God regard all equally: nor is *Rebellion*, *Witchcraft*, and *Idolatry* any more Lawful in one Perſon than another.

G. My Lord, I ſee not what all this drives at, or that it is any Anſwer to what I ſaid laſt.

L. Sr, it leads me directly to it. You told me, that

that ſince the Saving of our Souls is the End for our being in any Church, you left me to Judge whether the People are ſafeſt in the Communion of Rome, or in the Church of England as to the depoſing Doctrine. My Judgment then is, that whether *Depoſing* be *Lawful* or *Unlawful* (for all are not of your Mind) you can claim no Advantage over us. For if it be *Lawful*, there can be no Danger of *Salvation* in a Church that holds it: and we are thus far upon equal Terms as to the Point in Queſtion. But if it be *Unlawful* (which is your Opinion) believe me, Sr, your Church is in a very ill Way, and has no Reaſon to chalenge any Advantage over the *Church of Rome*. Witneſs firſt the *Revolution*, in which your Church had the greateſt Hand; tho she was afterwards bubbled out of the beſt Part of the Fruits of it. Witneſs *2dly*, the following *Act* paſſed by both Houſes of *Parliament* ſome Time after the Revolution. *If the King and Queen ſhall be reconciled to the Church of Rome, or profeſs the popiſh Religion, or marry a Papiſt, then ſuch Perſons ſhall be excluded to inherit the Crown, or have regal Power in the Realm, and the People ſhall be abſolved of their Allegiance.* This Act was aſſented to not only by the *Repreſentatives* of the *People*, but likewiſe by the *Repreſentatives* of the *Church of England*, I mean the *Biſhops*. Now I believe you will be puzled to find any Thing ſo clear, ſo ſtrong, and deciſive for the *Pope's depoſing Power* in any *Canon* of the *Church of Rome*, as this *Act of Parliament* is for the *depoſing Power* of the *People of England*. And therefore I think I ſhew myſelf very moderate in Adviſing you to come to a fair Compoſition as to the Point in Queſtion; and not to boaſt or ſwagger, as if you had ſome ſignal Advantage over us.

But let all this be as it will; if after all you will needs maintain, that *Depoſing* is the ſame as *Rebel-*

ſing, and ſtigmatize it with the odious Names of *Witchcraft* and *Idolatry*, you may do as you think fitting. But for my Part I am not fond of a Lodging in *Newgate*, and therefore will give it no ſuch Names; which may perhaps offend the Government. This I maintain poſitively, that the *Pope's depoſing Power* is diſown'd by far the greateſt Number of *Roman Catholicks*. So that there is no Danger on that Score in the Communion of the *Church of Rome*. Nay in *France*, where they are ſound Catholicks, no Divine dares teach it.

» *G.* My Lord, my Diſpute is with the *Church of* » *Rome*. And if the *Church of France* differs from the » *Church of Rome* in Matters, whereon Salvation » depends, they cannot be ſaid to be *one Church*, or » to have the ſame Guides to Heaven. *pag.* 69.

L. I take you, Sr, to be extremely out in your Caſuiſtry in pretending that *French* and *Italian* Divines cannot be of the ſame Church, becauſe they differ in their Opinions concerning a moral Duty; which only obliges a Man to follow in Practice, what in his Conſcience he Judges to be moſt reaſonable. Is there any thing more common either among *Proteſtant* or *Catholick Divines* than to be of different Opinions in Deciding Caſes relating to moral Duties? And yet there is not a moral Duty, but *Salvation* is more or leſs concern'd in it. Yet this Difference makes no Breach of Communion. And why then will you not vouchſafe to ſee, that *Italian* and *French* Divines, tho they differ in a moral Queſtion, may yet be truly in one Church, and have the ſame Guides to Heaven?

§. 41.

The ſame Subject continued.

G. BUt, My Lord, the *Pope's depoſing Power* ex- « tended itſelf even to *France:* of which you « will find frequent Inſtances in Hiſtory. And even « ſo late as the *holy League* againſt *Henry* the 3d. All « the *Popes* in that Time join'd with the *League* a- « gainſt the King, and ſupported the Rebellion by « their Authority. And the Generality of the *Biſhops* « and *Clergy* of *France*, and their *Univerſities* took « Part with the League, and juſtified it by Principle « and in Print. The Book *of the juſt Abdication of* « *Henry the* 3*d King of France* was then writ upon the « Foot of the *depoſing Power*, not only of the *Pope*, « but alſo of the *People*. pag. 69. 70. «

L. Ay Marry, Sr, the *depoſing Power of the People* is ſomething: for without it, that of the *Pope* will do but little Execution. But what need of running back as far as the *French League* for an Inſtance I mean not of the *Pope's*, but of the *People's* depoſing Power? Have we not one of a much fresher date at Home? To wit, the *Engliſh League*, which produced the *Revolution*. And did not the Generality of the *Biſhops* and *Clergy* of *England*, and the two *Univerſities* take Part in this League? Was it not juſtified *by Principle*, and innumerable Books writ in Defence of it upon the Foot of the *depoſing Power* lodg'd in the *People?* Now; Sr, you may go on.

G. D'*Avila* in his Hiſtory of the civil Wars « in *France* tells us a great and ſolemn Proceſſion « was made by Order from the *Cardinal Legate* to « implore God's Aſſiſtance (for the Succeſs of the « League againſt the King) in which the *Prelates*, «

» *Prieſts* and *Monks* of the ſeveral Religious Orders
» walk'd all in their accuſtom'd Habits. But beſides
» them arm'd openly with Corſlets, Guns, Swords,
» and all kind of Arms offenſive and defenſive:
» making at once a double ſhew both of Devotion,
» and Conſtancy of Heart to defend themſelves.
» Which Ceremony, tho it ſeem'd undecent and
» ridiculous (ſays d'*Avila*) yet was of great Uſe to
» augment and confirm the Courage of the common
» People. And the *Cardinal Legate* ſays in the De-
» claration he publish'd to the Leaguers; that to
» acknowledge an *Heretick* for their King *is the Dream*
» *of a Mad-man, which proceeds from nothing elſe but*
» *heretical Contagion.* pag. 70. 71.

L. Sr, the Ceremony deſcribed by d'*Avila* was certainly undecent and ridiculous. But, as to the *Cardinal's* Declaration, do's it not expreſs the preſent Sentiments of the *Church of England* in Relation to a *Popiſh Succeſſor?* And where then is the Difference as to the *Safety* of *Salvation?*

» *G.* My Lord, the *Leaguers* ſhew'd, wherein
» they placed their Confidence, and ſayd, they are
» the moſt *holy Fathers* (the *Popes*) and the moſt *holy*
» *See*, that have ſent us Relief. And tho many have
» been call'd to that holy Dignity ſince the laſt
» troubles, yet has there not been one of them, who
» has changed his Affection towards us. A moſt cer-
» tain Teſtimony, that our Cauſe is juſt. [D'*Avila*
» pag. 598.] pag. 71.

L. Sr, the *French Leaguers* were certainly very much influenced by the Authority of ſome *Popes*, who ſided with the *League*. But were not the People of *Great Britain* at a certain Time influenced in the ſame Manner by their *Spiritual Guides?* I mean, the *Biſhops* and *Clergy?* Remember but the Hiſtory of the *ſeven golden Candleſticks*, and the *Prince* of [illegible]

printed Declaration, *that he was call'd in by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal*, and there will be no Room left to doubt of it. I am ſorry, Sr, you oblige me to the odious Task of Recriminating. But ſince you are ſo very tart upon the *Church of Rome*, becauſe ſome of that Communion teach, and ſome have practiſed the *depoſing Doctrine*, and you even claim a mighty Advantage over her upon that Head, you lay a Neceſſity upon me to put you in Mind of theſe ungrateful Truths, that you may not be ſo warm in Condemning your Enemies abroad, for what you practiſe yourſelves at home without any Scruple.

G. To return to the *French League*, there were « *ſix Popes* during that Time, viz. *Gregory* XIII. *Sixtus* V. *Urban* VII. *Gregory* XIV. *Innocent* IX. and « *Clement* VIII. And they ſupported that Rebellion « not only with their Bleſſing it and the Authors of « it, and Curſing the King and all his loyal Sub- « jects, who adhered to him; but they ſent more « ſubſtantial Relief, *viz.* 300000 Crowns for the « Service of the *Cardinal* of *Bourbon*, whom they had « choſen by the Name of *Charles* the *tenth* againſt the « next in Blood, only becauſe he was a *Proteſtant:* « and 15000 Crowns a Month to carry on that Re- « bellion with an Army of 6000 Foot, and 1200 « Horſe to aſſiſt theſe *holy Leaguers*, pag. 71. «

L. Juſt ſo, Sr, did Queen *Elizabeth* the *Head* and *Foundreß* of your Church aſſiſt the *Dutch Leaguers* with Men and Money againſt King *Philip*. And your *Royal Martyr* King *Charles* I. aſſiſted the Rebels of *Rochel* againſt *Lewis* the 13th their undoubted Sovereign.

G. The *Pope* went Heart and Hand into the « Work, which he accounted excellently good « (ſays d'*Avila*) and of wonderful Glory and Ad- « vantage to the *Apoſtolick See*. And afterwards when «

» the Succeſs of the King's Arms had induced ſe-
» veral of the *Clergy*, and others to come over to
» him, the *Pope* ſent *his Monitory Letters to the Pre-*
» *lates and Catholicks commanding them under Pain of*
» *Excommunication, and of being deprived of their Di-*
» *gnities and Benefices, and of being uſed as Sectaries*
» *and Hereticks, that they ſhould withdraw themſelves*
» *from thoſe Places, that yielded Obedience to Henry of*
» *Bourbon* (ſo he ſtiled the King) *and from the Union*
» *and Fellowſhip of his Faction.* D'Avila L. 13. p. 613.
» And the Authority of the *Pope* prevail'd ſo far at
» laſt, that thoſe *Catholicks*, who had join'd with
» the King, form'd a Conſpiracy againſt him upon
» his delay of Changing his Religion; wherein the
» Princes of the Blood were moſt violent, and told
» him plainly to his Face, that if he did not perform
» his Promiſe (to turn *Roman Catholick*) they would
» deſert him, and join with the League. *Ibid. pag.*
» 611. 612. *pag.* 71. 72.

L. Sr, I muſt beg Leave to interrupt you for a Moment. You have named ſix Popes, that ſided with the *French League*. Firſt, it is nothing to the Purpoſe whether they did or no. For if the *depoſing Doctrine* be falſe, the *Popes*, that join'd with the League were to be blamed; and 'tis a convincing Proof, that they are not *impeccable*. But, whether, that Doctrine be true or falſe (for 'tis not my Buſineſs to decide the Queſtion) they did no more than the *Engliſh Biſhops* and *Clergy* did at the *Revolution*, and have done ever ſince upon *Revolution principles*. So that, whether *Right* or *Wrong*, they and the *Popes* have nothing to reproach one another. However you are ſomewhat Miſtaken in your Number of thoſe Popes, that ſided with the League. For *Maimbourg*, whom no Man can accuſe of being too favourable to the *Court* of *Rome*, tells us in his Hiſtory of the

French League tranſlated by Mr *Dryden* pag. 67. that Pope *Gregory* XIII. conſtantly perſiſted in Refuſing to approve the League: and *Urban* the 7th enjoy'd the Pontificat for ſo ſhort a Time that he could have no Part in their Counſels. Now, Sr, you may tell your whole Story out if you pleaſe.

G. After the Converſion of *Henry* IV. and his being by that eſtabliſh'd on the Throne, they fear'd his Power, and therefore the Pope (as now) made leſs Noiſe with the *depoſing Doctrine*, which yet he would not diſown, but kept it in *Petto* till a fitter Opportunity. But yet it was not carried ſo covertly, but that even in their Sermons wiſe and willing Men might know their Meaning. *Ravaillac* upon his Examination alledg'd the *Lent-Sermons* before his Aſſaſination of *Henry* IV. as the Ground and Encouragement to that execrable Fact. But after that magnanimous Prince had thus faln a Sacrifice to their reſtleſs furious Zeal, and his Son ſucceeded Young and fenceleſs to the Government, then they ſet up again the *depoſing Doctrine* on High; becauſe then they durſt do it. With which our King *James* do's juſtly upbraid them, particularly his Opponent the Cardinal of *Perron* in his Preface to his Book entitled (*a Defence of the Right of Kings*) for it was but five Years after the Murder of *Henry* IV. *viz.* An. 1615. that Cardinal *Perron* in the Aſſembly of the *three Eſtates* of *France*, and in the Name of the *firſt Eſtate*, that is, of the *Clergy*, did reaſſert the Power of the Pope to *depoſe Kings* with this Reaſon, *that otherwiſe there had not been any Church for many Ages paſt, and that indeed the Church* (he meant the *Church of Rome*) *would be the very Synagogue of Antichriſt.*

But, to come to a freſh Inſtance now on Foot,

» Pere *Jouvency* a *French Jeſuit* has lately printed a
» Book at *Rome* in Defence of the Pope's Power to
» depoſe Princes: And the Unwillingneſs and Shifts
» of the *Jeſuits* at *Paris* to diſown him in this, and
» to diſclaim that Doctrine fairly and above Board
» ſhews, that it is not yet quite extinguiſh'd in
» *France*, but kept up in the Embers as in the Reign
» of *Henry* IV. For all, who underſtand that Order
» of the *Jeſuits*, know full well that none of them
» dare print eſpecially upon ſuch a Subject without
» the Approbation of their Superiours, and that
» *France* is not entirely free from the Infection. And,
» tho the Vigour of this King has depreſs'd it very
» much, we cannot ſay it is totally extinguiſh'd,
» or that there is no Danger of a Relapſe, whilſt the
» Authority of the Pope is revered as *Head* of the
» *Catholick Church*, and the *Council* of *Lateran* is ſtill
» own'd as truly *general* and *infallible*, and the Biſh-
» ops of *France* ſtill take an Oath of *Fidelity* and *O-*
» *bedience* to the Pope. *pag.* 72. 73. 74.

L. Well, Sr, I preſume you have now finiſh'd your Satyr upon the *Depoſing Doctrine*. But what is it you chiefly drive at?

G. My Lord, I have told you that already. 'Tis to convince your *Lordſhip*, that the People are ſafer in the *Church* of *England*, than in the *Church* of *Rome*.

L. Truly, Sr, if *Depoſing* be a *godly Work*, I own the People to be very ſafe (as to that Article) in the *Church* of *England*. But if it be true what you ſay, *viz.* that *Depoſing* is the ſame as *Rebelling*; then all you have ſaid, nay tho you could ſay ten Times more againſt the *Church of Rome* upon that Head, is fully anſwer'd by theſe two Verſes in St *Mathew* C. 7. *Why beholdeſt thou the Mote, that is in thy Brother's Eye, but conſiderſt not the Beam, that is in thy own*

n Eye? Thou Hypocrite, firſt caſt out the Beam out of y own Eye, and then ſhalt thou See clearly to caſt out e Mote out of thy Brother's Eye. Math. 7. ℣. 3, 5.

However I deſire you not to expect that I ſhall ain iſſue with you in your Notion of it; or call the ractice of it *Rebellion*, *Witchcraft*, *Idolatry*, and hat not! For I am not ſo void of Senſe as not to eflect that I live under the Protection of a Govern-ent, which will not perhaps relish ſuch harsh Ex-reſſions. I likewiſe remember that not many Years go a certain *Proteſtant Divine* was upon the very rink of utter Ruine for preſuming to preach up ne Doctrine of *paſſive Obedience*, and *Non-reſiſtance*; nd an eminent Member of *Parliament*, who was ne of the Managers againſt him, ſtuck not to ay, that if the Doctrine of *paſſive Obedience* and *Non-reſiſtance* were maintainable, *Queen Ann had o more Title to the Crown of Great Britain than My Lord Mayor's Horſe.* Nor have I forgot that the old Author of *Hereditary Right*, *&c.* was condem-ed to eat the Bread of Sorrow, and drink the Waters of Tribulation for two whole Years toge-her in the *Marſhalſee*, even whilſt the *high Church* ad the Reins of Government in their Hands. Now o deal plainly with you, I have no Ambition to be Boarder in that Place, and therefore will not med-lle with *Politicks*. But, whoever will but give him-elf Time to reflect upon the Part your Church has ad in the Tranſactions of above thirty Years paſt, nuſt be ſurpriz'd to find you ſo very ſharp upon he *Depoſing Doctrine*, and *Practice* of a few *Papiſts*, vhen it was your Buſineſs to conſider firſt, whether ll were well guarded at Home. For let me tell you, Sr, this Caution is very neceſſary in Diſputes: Since vithout it you only put Stones into the Hands of an Adverſary to throw at you: nor are any privi-

ledg'd *to throw the firſt Stone*, but they, *who are free from Sin.*

Now, Sr, I have shew'd from undeniable Facts, that a Man may be a very *good Proteſtant*, nay a good *Church of England-Man*, tho he holds the *Depoſing Power* of the *People*, and *believes* it, and *practiſes* it too. Whether therefore that Doctrine be true or falſe, right or wrong, 'tis certain you cannot condemn thoſe amongſt *Papiſts*, that hold that Power lodg'd in the *Pope* without Condemning your own *Church* in the higheſt Degree. For it is beyond my Comprehenſion, that *Depoſing* should be *Rebellion*, *Witchcraft*, and *Idolatry*, when it is commanded by the *Pope* againſt a *Proteſtant Prince*, and have nothing of this foul Aſpect, when it is executed by *Proteſtants* againſt a *Popiſh Prince.*

Nay, Sr, you quarrel with us meerly for the *Speculative* Doctrine of the *Pope's depoſing Power* (for there is no great Danger of it's taking Effect) when at the ſame Time the *Practice* of the *People's depoſing Power* runs violently on the *Proteſtant Side*; as may be clearly proved from the Hiſtories of all the *Proteſtant* Countries in *Europe.* Alas, Sr, the *depoſing Power* of the *Pope* is but a Fleabite to that of the *People:* and give me Leave to tell you, that one *Act* of a *British Parliament* do's more Execution in the Buſineſs of *Depoſing* than twenty *Papal Bulls.* For the *Pope* can never depoſe without the *People*, but the *People* have depoſed many a Prince without the *Pope.* So pray, Sr, let the good old Gentleman live quietly at *Rome*, and meddle no more with him, till he meddles with you.

§. 42.

The Oath *of the* Bishops *to the* Pope *is no Prejudice to their* Allegiance.

G. MY Lord, I muſt beg your Pardon; I have not yet done with him. Nor have you ſaid any Thing to what I objected concerning the *Oath* of *Fidelity*, which the Bishops of *France* as well as others take to the *Pope*.

L. Why should they not? That Oath is not inconſiſtent with their Fidelity to the King.

G. Pray, My Lord, let me ask you, is not an « *Oath* to be taken in the *known* and *declared* Senſe « of the *Impoſer*, for whoſe Security it is taken? « *pag.* 74. «

L. Well, what then?

G. Then the Queſtion will be, what the *Pope* « means by the *Regalia* of St *Peter*, and all the *Rights*, « *Prerogatives*, *&c.* of the *Apoſtolick Chaire*, as he calls « his own; to which the Bishops are ſworn *contra* « *omnem hominem*, againſt all Men in the World? « For it is the *Pope*, who impoſes this Oath, and it « is taken for his Security. *Pag.* 74. «

L. Very right, Sr. But, if the Pope's Senſe of it be *known* and *declared*, as you told me juſt now, how can there be any Queſtion about the Meaning of it? I think it very plain, that neither the *Impoſer* nor *Taker* of the Oath can mean any Thing more, than the *juſt Rights* and *Prerogatives* of the *Apoſtolick See*.

G. But, My Lord, has he not ſufficiently de- « clared what he means by the Oath? Take it in the « Words of *the Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris* « in the *Appendix*, pag. 42. where they ſay that by «

» this Decree (of the *Bulla Cœnæ*) the Popes de-
» clare themſelves *Sovereign Monarchs* of the World,
» *pag.* 74. 75.

L. Surely, Sr, you are ſeiz'd with a more than ordinary Diſſipation of Mind, to talk thus wildly from the Purpoſe. Our Diſpute is concerning the *Oath*, which *Biſhops* take to the *Pope*, and you refer me to Mr *Talon's* Speech in *Parliament* interpreting the *Bulla Cœnæ* according to his own Notion. Is Mr *Talon* an authentick Interpreter of the *Bull?* What it is then to the Purpoſe, if in the Violence of his Heat he tells us, that *the Popes by that Decree make themſelves Sovereign Monarchs of the World?* For my Part I find no ſuch Thing in the Bull; nor do I think it can be drawn as a legal Conſequence from it.

I add, that *Rights and Prerogatives in an Edict ſignify thoſe, that are certain and unconteſted. For in the Eye of the Law a diſputed Right is not one abſolutely, but at moſt a probable and reaſonable Pretenſion to it.* [the *Caſe review'd* in the Preface.] Whence it follows, that the Oath taken by the Biſhops at their Conſecration to maintain the *Regalia* of St *Peter* can only be underſtood of the *unconteſted Rights* and *Prerogatives* of the *Apoſtolick See*; For they ſwear to no more that what the Words of the Oath expreſly import; and the Pope himſelf knows very well, that no Biſhop in the World intends to bind himſelf by that Oath to maintain him in any Pretenſions, that are prejudicial either to his Lawful Sovereign, or the ancient Liberties of his own particular Church.

» *G.* My Lord this (viz. *the Pope's abſolute Sove-*
» *reignty over Kings and Biſhops*) is no more than is
» given at their Coronation: as you have it in the
» *Roman Pontifical*; where the triple Crown is put
» upon the Pope's Head with theſe Words, Receive

this Diadem adorn'd with three Crowns and know your- «
ſelf to be the Father of Princes and Kings, the Gover- «
nour of the World, and Vicar upon Earth of our Saviour «
Jeſus Chriſt. pag. 75. «

L. Sr, the Words of the *Pontifical* are not improper, and expreſs no more, than the Pope's *ſpiritual Supremacy* over the *whole Church*, which in Scripture-Language is call'd the Church *of all Nations*, or *the whole World*; as I have ſaid before. He is *Vicar of Chriſt* upon Earth, as he is the *Succeſſor* of St *Peter*, to whom *Chriſt* committed the Care of his *whole Flock*. He is likewiſe the *ſpiritual Father* of Princes and Kings, and the *Governour of the World* in *Spirituals:* becauſe he has a ſpiritual Juriſdiction over the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*. Yet all this comes not up to the ridiculous Title of *Sovereign Monarch of the World*. Becauſe a *Sovereign Monarch* is properly one, under whom all others in Emploiment are no more than *Subſtitutes*, or *Vicars*, placeable and diſplaceable at Pleaſure: Whereas each Bishop governs his reſpective Dioceſs in his own Right; and, as to all Manner of *Epiſcopal Functions*, has an *independent Juriſdiction* in it, nor can he be deprived without a *Canonical Fault*.

G. But muſt not this *Governour of the World* have « Power to dethrone all petty Kings and Princes, « that are under him? Elſe how can he govern the « World? *pag.* 75. «

L. Juſt as a *Bishop* can govern his *Dioceſs* without having the Power to abſolve Children from their Duty to their Parents, or take their Eſtates away from them, or turn them out of Doors.

G. The Popes think, that this their Power of « Depoſing Princes is fully recogniz'd to them in the « foreſaid *Canon* of the *Lateran Council*: and no Pope « has ever yet been brought to diſown this Power. *p.* 75. «

L. And *Princes* think, that this Power is not recogniz'd in that *Canon*. And they have the great Body of *Catholick Bishops* and *Divines* on their Side. And theſe have never yet been brought to diſown their Opinion, and yet they are united in Communion with the *Bishop* of *Rome*. Which ſhews, that the *Faith* of the *Church* is not at all concern'd in it.

» *G.* Nay the *Pope* is ſo far from diſowning this » Power, that he, who moſt of any aſſerted this *Bulla* » *Cœnæ*, and ſet it up high, cauſing it to be affix'd » and publish'd not only at the Doors of the Chur- » ches in *Rome*, but in the *Field* of *Flora*, that all » might take Notice, as you find at the End of the » *Bull* pag. 37. *Append.* and who practiſed the *Depo-* » *ſing Power* the laſt in *England* upon Queen *Eliza-* » *beth*, abſolving their Subjects from their Alle- » giance, and commanding all the *Catholicks* in *Eng-* » *land* to pay no more Obedience, nor Taxes, &c. » I ſay, this ſame Pope has been pick'd out to be » canoniz'd for a *Saint* this very laſt Summer Ann. » 1712. by the preſent Pope with all the Solemnity » and Requiſits in the *Church* of *Rome* for Making a » *Saint*. pag. 75. 76.

L. Sr, 'tis God alone makes Saints, and the Church only declares them to be ſo. But she never declares any to be ſo without a *moral Certainty* of the Holineſs of their Lives paſt, which without a poſitive Revelation is all we can have of the greateſt Saints. 'Tis true *Pius* V. was the laſt Pope, that exerciſed the *Depoſing Power*. But he exerciſed it upon a Perſon, whoſe illegitimacy he was convinced of: and he thought it his Duty to do Juſtice to an injured Princeſs, the Queen of the *Scots*, whom the Crown was Judg'd to belong to by many more beſides himſelf. So that I ſee no Reaſon why that Action should unſaint him.

§. 43.

The Bulla Cœnæ.

MY Lord, to return to the *Bulla Cœnæ*, « this preſent Pope as well as his Prede- « ſſors do every Year thunder out the *Excommu-* « *cations* of this *Bull* by *Bell*, *Book*, and *Candle*, « hich like *Dracanſor* cuts down *Friends* and *Foes*. « or there never was a *Roman Catholick* King in *En-* « *and*, or in any other Kingdom either before the « *formation* or Since, but is excommnicated by the « *ull*; and by the 24th Article paſt the Power even « the *Pope* to abſolve him, unleſs he firſt abro- « tes and annuls all the Laws of his Country, « hich are contrary to the Tenor of this *Bull*. And « is never yet was done, and I dare ſay never will « done in any *popiſh* Country in *Europe*. And « ere is not, nor ever was any *popiſh Country* in « y other Part of the World, unleſs you will ex- « pt the late *Spaniſh* Plantations in *America*. pag. « 5. «

L. Sr, according to my ſmall knowledge in *Geography*, neither *Aſia* nor *Africa* are in *Europe*; and yet ey were in Communion with the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, id acknowledg'd his *Supremacy* for many hundred ears together, as I have ſhew'd before. But this ing wholly foreign to our preſent Purpoſe, let us nſider what you have ſaid concerning our terrible *racanſor*, which indeed is both curious and new. or it ſeems he makes clear Work once a Year, id cuts down *Friends* and *Foes* without Diſtinction: id I preſume when *Friends* themſelves are cut wn, *Neuters* muſt expect no Quarter. So that, as u have order'd the Matter, the *Pope* ſends his

whole Flock to the *Devil* regularly once a Year in *holy Week* to prepare them for their *Easter-Devotion*. Miſerable Condition of *Papiſts!* I hope however Matters are not quite ſo bad as you make them. There are ſome News-writers, who deſtroy whole Armies in their Papers, whilſt they are perfectly ſound and ſafe in their Quarters: And I am apt to think you have done more Execution in two Lines, than all the Pope's *Bulls* have ever done ſince the Time of the *Apoſtles*.

But to give ſome ſerious Anſwer to this ridiculous *Gaſconade* I ſhall recite the Words of an ingenious Author upon this Subject. *We believe* (ſays he) *the Pope is Head of the Church* Jure divino. *But how far this Prerogative reaches is not agree'd upon. The Council of Florence ſeems to limit it to the Canons of General Councils.* Quemadmodum & in ſacris Canonibus continetur. *And altho many Divines ſtretch it ſo far as to make all his Decrees Laws for the whole Church, yet this is Opinion only, not Faith. Nor can we find this Doctrine defined in any Council, or propoſed in any Profeſſion of Faith, or in any Book put out by the Authority of the Church for the Inſtruction of the Faithful. Nay the Rules of Diſcipline preſcribed by the very Council of Trent are not received in many Places and Provinces, thô we believe a general Council to be the higheſt Tribunal Eccleſiaſtical upon Earth.*

Now the Bulla Cœnæ *regarding Diſcipline and not Faith, and containing ſome Things derogatory to the Authority of Princes (as they think) ſeveral States have not received it: And this the Pope knows; yet he never put out another Bull to exact Obedience, or cenſured thoſe who refuſed Submiſſion. Which is a Mark, that tho he went not beyond his Power in Publiſhing it, he left to all States the Liberty to receive or reject it, except his own Subjects. And beſides he communicates as freely with thoſe States*

States that do not receive it as with those that do. Is not this an evident Sign, that he regards them not as Aliens, but as Domesticks, and true Sons of the Church? ----But where it is received, it has the Force of a Law, and the Transgressors are as liable to the Penalty of this Bull, as to that of other Laws. [The Case review'd, Preface, first Edit.]

The same Author (as I mention'd before) observes very Judiciously, *that Liberties and Rights in an Edict signify those, that are certain, and uncontested: For in the Eye of the Law a doubtful Privilege, or a Right disputable on both Sides is not a Right absolutely, but a probable or reasonable Pretension to it.*

Whence it follows, *first*, that the *Excommunications* of the *Bulla Cœnæ* fall only on the Transgressors in those Kingdoms or States, where it has been received: As the *Canons* of the *Council of Trent* relating to *Discipline* oblige only those Countries, that have received it without Limitation.

It follows *2dly*, that it only reaches such Princes, as invade the *known Liberties* of the *Church*, or the *uncontested Prerogatives* of the *Apostolick See*. And so you will be hard put to it to find a King in Danger of Dying without *Absolution*, tho he never thinks of *Abrogating* and *Annulling* the Laws of his own Country; which, as you observe very well, *never was, nor ever will be done in any popish Country*: Because I presume there never was; and perhaps there never will be any occasion for it. And so the numberless *excommunicated Kings* and *Princes*, you have thrown into your black List, will prove to be like Dr *Oate's* Army of 30000 *Spanish Pilgrims*,

Which *lay hid on the Shore,*
And never were heard of since or before.

But you have ſaid one Thing, which is very remarkable. Viz. *That there never was a Roman Catholick King in England or in any other Kingdom either before the Reformation or ſince, but is excommunicated by the Bulla Cœnæ.* That's very ſtrange indeed. For ſeveral Kings of *England*, and other Countries have been canoniz'd by the Pope. And do's he then canonize them firſt, and excommunicate them afterwards! But I long to hear ſome more News of this terrible *Dracanſor.*

» *G.* Not only the *Kings* themſelves, but all their » *Parliaments*, *Councellors*, *Judges*, *Officers*, even to » *Printers* and *Publiſhers*, or any whoſoever, *that* » *either directly or indirectly, tacitly or expreſsly violate,* » *depreſs, or reſtrain the Eccleſiaſtical Liberties or Rights* » *of the Apoſtolick See, and holy Church of Rome how-* » *ſoever and whenſoever obtain'd, or to be obtain'd*, are » all here together excommunicated: as likewiſe » *Archbiſhops*, *Biſhops*, and *Clergy*, who ſhall do the » ſame; and all who ſhall preſume to attempt any » *Oppoſition* or *Contravention* to any Thing contain'd » in the *Bull*, are left under the Diſpleaſure of Al- » mighty God, and his bleſſed Apoſtles *Peter* and » *Paul*; which is the concluding Sanction of the » *Bull.* And here *Saints* muſt be join'd with *God*, » leaſt his Diſpleaſure ſhould not be ſufficient. By » all this it appears, that there is hardly any *Roman* » *Catholick* in the World above the Condition of a » *Plowman*, who is not excommunicated by this » Bull. *pag.* 76. 77.

L. Sr, I think I am ſomething above the Condition of a *Plowman*, yet I thank God, I don't know I ever was excommunicated by the *Bulla Cœnæ.* But I ſhall put this ſhort Dilemma to you. Either the Perſons mention'd in the Bull invade the *known Liberties* of the *Church*, and *uncontеſted Prerogatives*

= *Apoſtolick See*, or not. If not, the *Bull* cannot
ırt them. If they do, why should they not be pu-
sh'd for their Injuſtice? Has not the *Church*, and
er *Supreme Paſtor* as juſt a Title to the *Immunities*
nd *Rights*, that have been granted them by the *Ca-*
ns of Councils, and the Liberality of Chriſtian
'rinces and Emperors, as the People has to *Liberty*
nd *Property*, or any Secular Prince to the *Preroga-*
ves of his *Crown?* Or is the *Church* and *Clergy* ſo
:ſpicable a Part of the Univerſe, that they muſt
: treated like *Banditi's*, and any Man shall be per-
itted to invade their Rights *impune?* Kings are ar-
'd with *Secular Power* to do themſelves juſtice; if
ey be wrong'd by any other King. But when the
burch, or her *common Father* is wrong'd by any
:ince, they have nothing, but *Spiritual Arms* to
:fend themſelves. And therefore the Pope do's but
t within his proper Sphere, when he uſes the *Spi-*
ual Sword, I mean, the Power of *Excommunicating*,
ıich God has undoubtedly put into his Hands, to
ınish the Invaders of his own, or the Church's
ights together with their Accomplices and Abet-
ırs, let them be as numerous as they pleaſe.

However where are thoſe vaſt Numbers of *ex-*
mmunicated Offenders? Who are the *Kings*, *Arch-*
:hops, and *Bishops*, that *violate*, *depreſs*, or *reſtrain*
e *Eccleſiaſtical Liberties*, or *undoubted Rights* of the
poſtolical Chair? I know not where to find them in
wope. Nor have we any News of them from the
anish Plantations in *America*. I hope then by the
race of God, there may be a good reaſonable
umber above the Condition of a *Plowman*, who
they never tranſgreſs'd againſt the *Bull*, never in-
rr'd the Penalty of it. So that you will be obliged
make ſome Amendments and Deductions in your
ll; before I shall give my Aſſent to it.

» *G.* At leaſt, My Lord, you plainly ſee the *Pope* » aſſuming a *temporal* or *civil* Power over all *Empe-* » *rors*, *Kings*, and *Princes*; limiting them by the 5th » Article as to the Raiſing Taxes upon their own » Subjects without his expreſs Licence, and Exemp- » ting all *Eccleſiaſticks* from being tax'd by them » Art. 18. or being under their Power either in *Civil* » or *Criminal* Cauſes, as by Art. 19. tho it were » *Treaſon*, *Murder*, *&c.* For which noble Principle » *Thomas Becket* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* was cano- » niz'd for Maintaining the Liberties of the *holy* » *Church*. pag. 77.

L. Sr, had *Thomas Cranmer* had the Honeſty and Courage to maintain the Liberties of the *holy Church*, as his Predeceſſor *Thomas Becket* did, the *Engliſh Clergy* would not be ſo overaw'd by the *ſecular Power*, as they now are. But *Thomas Cranmer* had ſomething nearer to his Heart, than his *holy Spouſe* the *Church*, whom he baſely betray'd to the Cruelty and Avarice of an arbitrary Prince. And the Memory of the one will always be as contemptible and odious, as that of the other is venerable in *God's Church*.

However I never read, that *Thomas Becket* (as you call him) was ever guilty of *Murder* or *Treaſon*. For he neither ſtirr'd up the People againſt his *Sovereign*, nor levied Troops againſt him, nor call'd in Forces from abroad, nor met him arm'd in the Field. But *Tears* and *Prayers* were all the Arms, he uſed againſt his violent Perſecutor, becauſe he was the *Lord's Anointed*. He truly practiſed the Doctrine of *paſſive Obedience* and *Non-reſiſtance*; not indeed by a baſe and wicked Complyance, but by a patient Suffering of Perſecution, Banishment, and Death for *Juſtice-ſake*. For this, and the Holineſs of his Life atteſted by undeniable Miracles he was *canoniz'd* by the *Church*; and *Chriſt* himſelf has canoniz'd all ſuch. *Mat.* 5. ✝. 10.

G. I perceive, My Lord, I have warm'd your zeal. But what do you ſay to the three Articles of Impeachment againſt the *Bulla Cœnæ*?

L. Sr, the firſt is a Miſtake, and the two latter are frivolous. 'Tis a Miſtake, nay a Thing unheard of, that *Sovereign Princes* are limited by that *Bull* as to their Raiſing Taxes upon their *Lay-ſubjects*. Neither has the *Papal Sentence*, you refer to, any Relation to *Sovereigns*, but only to *inferiour Princes*, who without Leave from their reſpective Maſters oppreſs'd their Subjects with unjuſt Taxes. So that the Pope's pretended Tyranny, you complain of in this Point, is a real Vindication of the People's Liberties, and the Rights of *Sovereigns*.

But, as to the Exemption of the *Clergy* from Taxes, and *Secular Tribunals*, theſe two Privileges of the Church are as ancient as the firſt *Chriſtian Emperors*. So that when St *Thomas* of *Canterbury* (if I may call him ſo without Offence) ſtood up for the *Privileges* of the *Church* againſt the Encroachments of *Henry* the 2d, he only maintain'd what he had found eſtabliſh'd before him. And let me tell you, Sr, 'tis no Dishonour to the Memory of a *good Shepherd* to leave his *Flock* in as good a Condition as he found it.

G. But, My Lord, I leave it now to yourſelf, « whether, if you were a *King*, you would deſire all « the *Biſhops* of your Kingdom to be under an *Oath* « of *Fidelity* to another, who pretended an *abſolute* « and *civil Power* over you with Authority to *depoſe* « you, as he has done to ſeveral of your Predeceſ- « ſors, and would by no Means be brought to diſ- « claim ſuch a Power, but on the contrary made a « freſh Claim of it every Year, and of his being the « *Sovereign Monarch* of the World? *pag.* 77. «

L. You ſay, *you leave it to me, whether if I were a*

King I would deſire all the Biſhops of my Kingdom to be under an Oath of Fidelity to another, &c. To deal plainly with you, Sr, if I found by Experience, that *Biſhops* under that Oath were generally more *loyal* and *faithful* to their *Lawful Sovereigns* than ſome other *Biſhops*, who take no ſuch Oath, I ſhould have no Reaſon to be againſt it. Now I have already ſhew'd that the *Oath* of *Fidelity*, or *Canonical Obedience*, which *Biſhops* take to the *Pope*., can never prejudice the juſt Rights of any *Sovereign*. For ſurely Men can *render to Cæſar what belongs to Cæſar* at the ſame Time that they *render to God what belongs to God*. And, as to the *Bulla Cœnæ*, it neither calls the Pope *Sovereign Monarch* of the World, nor gives him an *abſolute* and *Civil* Power over *Catholick Crown'd Heads*, whom all the World knows to be in *Temporals* as *abſolute* in their *Dominions*, as any *Proteſtant* Prince in *Europe*. Nay far more abſolute than the Kings of *Great Britain*, who cannot raiſe one Farthing of Money, nor impoſe any Taxes without the Conſent of the People. For this is the great Bulwark of the *Liberties* and *Properties* of *Engliſh* Subjects. And why then is it a Diſparagement to *Catholick Princes* not to have the Power of Levying Taxes on the *Clergy* without their own, or the *Pope's* Conſent, which never was refuſed by either in any reaſonable Exigency of the State?

Nor do's the Exemption of the *Clergy* from *Secular Tribunals* even in *capital Cauſes* any ways obſtruct the Courſe of Juſtice. For when a *Clergy-man* is firſt tried before the *Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal*, it is not done to ſhelter him from Juſtice, but to ſhew a Reſpect to the *Character*, he has dishonour'd. For, if he be found huilty, he is firſt *degraded*, and ſtripped of the Marks of his Dignity: And being thus *ſecularized*, as I may call it, and thrown into the

k of *Laymen*, he is deliver'd up to the *Secular* r to be punish'd as he deſerves. So that there Danger of the *Pope's* putting in his *Caveat* a- ſt it, or Intercepting the Courſe of Juſtice in Kingdom whatſoever, tho you will needs make the *Sovereign Monarch* of the World.

. Nay, My Lord, he puts in his *Claim* for « e, if more can be thought of, as it is worded « ie *Bulla Cœnæ Art.* 24. *All the Rights of the A-* « *ick See, and holy Church of Rome, howſoever and* « *ſoever obtain'd, or to be obtain'd, &c. Howſoever* « *n'd:* that is, you are not to enquire whether « r or *Wrong*: and *whenſoever*: that is, you are « to go back to *Antiquity*, or the *Inſtitution*, or « farther than the *preſent Poſſeſſion*, which with « gives Right, when it is for him. And, *to be* « *n'd*, ſecures any new Acquiſitions he can « e, and all *future Pretenſions*. This is like Swea- « to *& cæteras*. And now, I think the Plenitude « is Power is ſufficiently guarded. And all this « cluded in the *Regalia* of St *Peter*, and the « ts of the *Roman Church*, to which the *Biſhops* « *France*, as well as of other *Popiſh* Countries « ſworn, if they take that *Oath* ſincerely, that « ıccording to the known and declared Senſe of « *Impoſer.* pag. 78. «

. Sr, it is the firſt Time in my whole Life I been inform'd, either that the Word [*Rights*] ſies *Prerogatives* or *Poſſeſſions* got *Right* or *Wrong*: ıat the *Pope* has ever declared, that when his ceſt is concern'd, *Right* and *Wrong* ſignify the Thing. And, if he never has made ſuch a De- ıtion, a Perſon muſt be void of Shame and Con- ıce to tell me, that this is the *known* and *declared* of the *Impoſer* of the *Oath* in Queſtion.

. Why, My Lord, what do theſe Words then

mean, *Howſoever*, *Whenſoever obtain'd*, or *to be obtain'd?*

L. What do they mean, Sr! Why, every Man of common Senſe and Honeſty will tell you, that *Howſoever obtain'd* ſignifies, whether got by *Donation*, or *Bargain*, or any *juſt Way* whatſoever, whereby a lawful Poſſeſſion is acquired. And *whenſoever obtain'd*, imports, whether the Title be of a *freſh* or *ancient* Date. Becauſe a Title is equally juſt and valid, whether it was obtain'd Yeſterday, or a thouſand Years ago. Finally, a *Right* not yet obtain'd may be obtain'd hereafter; and when it is obtain'd, is as juſt as thoſe whereof we are already in Poſſeſſion: and they, who wrong the poſſeſſor in it are as muſt guilty of Injuſtice, as if they invaded the Rights of a thouſand Years ſtanding.

This, Sr, is the true, natural, and obvious Senſe of the 24th *Article* of the *Bull*. And therefore you are bound to retract your injurious Comment upon it; unleſs you will die guilty of Slander in Repreſenting the *Pope* as a profligate Vilain for Impoſing a wicked Oath, and all the *Catholick Biſhops* in the World as perjured Wretches for taking it.

§. 44.

Some Touches of the Gentleman's *Politicks.*

G. MY Lord, I ſuſpect the *Biſhops* of *France* take that *Oath* but with a very ill Will. For it would certainly have been taken away, that Model of *Government*, which was once propoſed by the *Parliament* of *Paris* had gone on. » And it had » gone on, but for the Succeſs of that Confederacy » form'd by *Innocent* the XI. againſt the King of » *France* to reeſtablish his *Supremacy* there. *p.* 78. 7

L. D

L. Do you ſay, Sr, *to reeſtablish his Supremacy here?* Pray, when was it loſt? Has not the *Pope* always communicated with the *Kings* and *Church* of *France?* And did you not tell me a while ago, *that the Church of Rome by her Principles cannot communicate with any, who will not own her Supremacy?* Pray, ſave his from a Contradiction, if you can.

G. You interrupted me, My Lord; for I was « going to tell you, that in Order to this Confede- « racy the *Pope* ſent a *Nuncio* to our late King *James* « to invite him to be the *Head* of it. But he, who « had learnt no other than *French Popery*, abſolutely « refuſed, and oppoſed the Encroachments of the « Pope's *Supremacy:* as appears plainly by his Con- « currence with Mr *Barillon* the *French* Embaſſador « then reſiding with him to cauſe the *Proceedings of* « *the Parliament of Paris* againſt the *Pope's Supremacy* « hereunto annex'd to be tranſlated into *English*, and « printed at *London* An. 1688. which was the laſt of « his Reigning here. *pag.* 79. «

L. Surely, Sr, you ſtudy to make Miſtakes. Elſe how can you tell me, that *the Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris* deny the *Pope's Supremacy?* When every Body, that has but Eyes to read, can diſprove you. They oppoſe indeed the *Pope's Infallibility*, and Power over the *Temporality* of *Princes*, but in plain and expreſs Terms acknowledge his *Supremacy* in *Spirituals*, as I have already shew'd §. 19. And if you will but do this, and profeſs the ſame *French Popery*, as King *James* did, I aſſure you, Sr, there will be an End of all Diſputes betwixt us.

G. However, My Lord, *the Pope* was not con- « tent with it, and had this for his Excuſe, that he « could not have otherwiſe carried on his Confede- « racy than by Concerring the *Depoſition* of King « *James:* who would not have agree'd to the firſt of «

» the Articles ſworn at the *Hague* by the *Princes* the
» *Allies*, and *Confederates* in *February* 1691. and print
» ted here at the ſame Time. Viz. *That no Peace*
» *made with Lewis XIV. till he has made Reparation*
» *the holy See for* whatſoever *he has acted againſt it*;
» *till he annul and make void all thoſe infamous Proce*
» *dings againſt the holy Father Innocent XI.* Theſe
» the *Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris* here an
» nex'd. And in the *Treaty* of King *William* with
» *Spain* bearing Date Dec. 31. An. 1690. it is ſtipu
» lated Art. 4. *That all Things in the Eccleſiaſtick (in*
» *France) ſhould be reſtored as in their former State.*
» Now, if King *James* would not come into theſe
» Things, was there not ſufficient Reaſon for the
» Pope to exerciſe his *Depoſing Power* againſt him in
» the beſt Manner he could? And, if he had ſuch
» Power from God, then King *James* had no Injury
» to complain of as done to him; being depoſed by
» his Lawful Superiour. King *Jame's* Fate was cer-
» tainly very hard. He was *abdicated* in *England* be-
» cauſe he was a *Papiſt*: and the *Pope* wrought his
» *Depoſition*, becauſe he was too much a *Proteſtant*.
» pag. 79. 80.

L. I perceive, Sr, you are moſt deeply read in Politicks, and will needs have it, that Pope *Innocent* XI. wrought the *Depoſition* of King *James*: for which you quote two Articles agree'd to, as you tell me, by the Confederates at the *Hague*, and printed in *London*. Now every Thing is not an infallible Truth, that is printed in *London*; and the aboveſaid Articles appear very extraordinary, becauſe it follows from them, that King *William* was a more *zealous Papiſt* even than King *James* himſelf; which I have ſome Difficulty to believe. But let that paſs, and take it now for granted, that the Articles were *genuine*, where do you find that the *Pope* had a Part

blige not all Nations equally, as I have already remark'd. And where they do not oblige, a Non-compliance cannot be punishable by *Excommunication*. And ſo the four Propoſitions, tho never ſo contrary to the *Bulla Cœnæ*, could not involve the *Gallican Church* in that Punishment.

Now then, as to what you have aſſerted with a Poſitiveneſs as if you had a Revelation of it, *viz.* that *Innocent* XI. wrought the *Depoſition of King James*, I ſhall beg leave not to believe one Word of your Story ſtill you produce ſome unconteſted Facts to prove it. Did *Innocent* abſolve King *James's* Subjects from the *Allegiance*, they had ſworn to him? Did his *Holineſs* give a Diſpenſation to the *Lords Spiritual and Temporal* to invite the *Prince* of *Orange* over? Was it by his Orders that the *Engliſh Fleet* let him paſs, and that the *Army* went over to him? Finally, did he ſend his *Bull* to authorize the *Convention* to place the *Crown* upon King *William's* Head? For, if he wrought King *James's* Depoſition, as you pretend he did, it muſt certainly be upon Record, that he employ'd ſome of the Means, I have mention'd, in Order to it. For I am ſure he neither ſent *Men* nor *Money* to aſſiſt the *Prince* of *Orange*.

But is it not ridiculous to run upon a Fool's Errand as far as *Rome* in Queſt of the true Inſtruments of the *Revolution*, when they may be found without the Trouble even of Croſſing the Seas? Why will you needs rob your own *Church* of the Glory of it, after she has ſignaliz'd herſelf ſo eminently in that important Service? Why muſt the *Pope* go away with the Honour of an Exploit, the Maintaining whereof has coſt *England* ſo much true *Proteſtant Blood* and *Treaſure*? Surely King *William*, who underſtood the Bottom of that Buſineſs the beſt of any, never thought himſelf indebted to his *Holineſs*

for the Succeſs of his Expedition. For if he had, he would never have requited his *Benefactor* by ſuffering him to be burnt *in Effigie* ſeveral Times a Year as long as he lived. But ſuppoſe it were ſo, what is it to our Purpoſe? Do you make no Difference between the *Church*, and the *Court* of *Rome?*

» *G.* I underſtand not the Diſtinction. If you » mean nothing by the *Church of Rome* but a *general* » *Council*, then there is no *Church of Rome* now in the » World. But if there be a *Church of Rome*, where » ſhall we look for it but at *Rome?* And what is it » there, but the *Pope* and his *Cardinals?* And is not » that it which you call the *Court* of *Rome?* Where » then is the Difference? *pag.* 81. 82.

L. Really, Sr, I cannot but admire your affected Ignorance, as if you knew no better than you pretend to do. You tell me you do not underſtand the Difference between the *Church and Court of Rome.* How can that be? Is not the *Pope* a *temporal Prince*, and a very conſiderable one as well as *Head* of the *Church?* As he is a *temporal Prince*, he has his *Court* and *Politicks* like other Princes. But as he is *Bishop* of the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, and *Head* of the *Church*, he is conſider'd purely in a *ſpiritual Capacity*, and as ſuch he has no *Court*, as that Word is uſually taken. For St *Peter* (whoſe Succeſſor he is in *Spirituals*) was both *Head* of the *Church*, and *Bishop* of *Rome*, yet had no *Court*. And when St *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, he wrote to the *Church*, but not the *Court* of *Rome*. They are therefore ſeparable, and by Conſequence diſtinct.

You tell me next, *if I mean nothing by the Church of Rome but a General Council, then there is no Church of Rome now in the World.* But who was ever ſo ridiculous, as to have ſuch a Meaning? For a *general Council* is neither the *Epiſcopal See* of *Rome*, nor the *Dif-*

fuſive Body of the *Roman Catholick Church*, but the *Repreſentative* of that Body. And therefore as there is a *British* Nation in Being, when there is no *British Parliament* ſitting, ſo I hope that neither the *Epiſcopal See* of *Rome*, nor the *Roman Catholick Church* loſe their Being, when there is not *general Council* aſſembled.

You ask, *if there be a Church of Rome, where is it to be look'd for but at Rome?* I anſwer, that it is a probable Opinion amongſt the learned, that neither the *City*, nor *Dioceſs of Rome* is the whole *Roman Catholick Church*, which however we commonly call the *Church* of *Rome*.

You ask again, *what is there at Rome but the Pope and his Cardinals?* Go to *Rome*, Sr, and you will find ſomething elſe beſides the *Pope*, and his *Cardinals*. I hope however they are not the whole *Roman Catholick Church*.

But I am weary of *Politicks*. For that is not our Buſineſs, but *Religion*; eſpecially ſince neither you nor I are ever like to be Miniſters of *State*. I am a Member of the *Church*, but not of the *Court* of *Rome*; and will always pay a due Submiſſion and Obedience to the *Pope*, as he is the *Chief Bishop*, and *Supreme Paſtor* of the *Church*.

§. 45.

The Supremacy *miſrepreſented by the* Gentleman.

G. THe *Precedence* of Bishops is not a Matter « of that Conſequence, as to break the « Peace of the Church for it: or which of them « should *preſide* in a *Council*. If that were all the Dif- « ference, the Bishop of *Rome* should have it with « all my Heart, or any other Bishop they should « agree upon. And if this were all that is meant by « the *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, we should not trouble «

» the World much about it. But he will not be con-
» tent with any ſuch Thing. The *Supremacy* he claims
» is no leſs than an *abſolute Sovereignty* over all the
» *Churches*, and *Kingdoms* of the Earth, their *Bish-*
» *ops*, and their *Kings*. And this not by any *Eccle-*
» *ſiaſtical* Conſtitution, or Grant of *temporal Princes*,
» which might be *conditional*, *limited*, and *revocable*,
» and would infer their Superiority to him; but by
» a *Divine* and *indefeaſible* Right, as *Succeſſor* of St
» *Peter*, and Heir of all the Promiſes to him, *unal-*
» *terable*, *unlimitable*, and *unaccountable* to any Power
» upon Earth. *pag.* 82.

L. What a hideous Monſter have you here made of the *Pope!* You tell me the *Supremacy* he claims is no leſs *than an abſolute Sovereignty over all the Kingdoms and Churches of the Earth, their Biſhops and their Kings, unalterable, unlimitable, and unaccountable to any Power upon Earth.* But where is the Proof of this exorbitant Notion of the *Supremacy?* Not a Word of that. Nay I only deſire you to name the Popes, who pretended that all *Biſhops* were their *Vicars* placeable and diſplaceable at Pleaſure; and all *Kings* their *Deputies* and *Viceregents?* For that is the immediate Conſequence, if they pretend, as you ſay they do, to be *abſolute Sovereigns unlimitable, and unaccountable to any Power upon Earth.*

This therefore is all Exaggeration; Nay the *Council* of *Florence* in it's Definition of the *Pope's Supremacy* tells us expreſſly, that *in the Perſon of St Peter he has received from our Lord Jeſus Chriſt full Power to feed, rule, and govern the* whole *Church in ſuch a Manner as is expreſs'd in the Acts of Oecumenical Councils, and the holy Canons.*

G. But do's not *Bellarmin*, and other *Italian Divines* give him a great Deal more?

L. Bellarmin allows him an *indirect Power* over the

Tempora-

Temporality of Princes, and an *Infallibility* in Defining doctrinal Points *Juridically*. But he is far from being guilty of raising the *Supremacy* to the fantastical Height, in which you have placed it. For he tells us expresly (L. 2. *de Pont.* C. 29.) *that as it is Lawful to resist the Pope, if he attempts upon our Lives, so is it also, if he invades our Souls, or raises Sedition in the commonwealth; and much more if he endeavours to destroy the Church.* So that the *spiritual Supremacy* is here declared *Limitable* and *Accountable* by *Bellarmin* himself, whom *Protestants* usually stile the *Pope's Champion.*

G. But when the *Pope* means one Thing by his « *Supremacy*, and you mean another, and he has suf- « ficiently declared what he means by it, and re- « quires your Owning it, and Swearing to it for his « Security, who deals more sincerely with him, we, « who not Believing any such *Supremacy* in him, will « neither own it, nor swear to it; or you, who not « believing it more than we in the Sense you know « he means, yet own it in general Terms, but in a « quite contrary Sense to what yow know he means, « and trusts to as his Security? We disown it, and « fight against it; you fight against it as much as we, « yet seem to own it. *pag.* 83. «

L. Pray, Sr, answer me this plain Question if you can. *Where, When, and upon what Occasion has the Pope sufficiently declared, that by the Supremacy he means an absolute Sovereignty over all Bishops and Kings unlimitable, and unaccountable to any Power upon Earth?* For if you cannot produce any such Declaration, as I am sure you cannot, your Reflection upon the *Pope's* pretended Meaning, and the *Oath*, which *Bishops* take to him, is highly injurious and defamatory. I shall add an Observation, which I take to be a positive Proof against you.

There never was a Book more ſolemnly and univerſally approved than the Bishop of *Meaux's Expoſition de la Foy.* This Book in the Article of the Pope's *Supremacy* gives him no more, than what the whole *Church of France* owns to belong to him *Jure divino.* Yet *Innocent* XI. who was the very Pope, that acted ſo vigorouſly againſt the Bishops of *France*, was ſo far from Cenſuring it for Lowering his *Supremacy*, that he approved it by a ſpecial Brief writ to the Bishop himſelf, *Jan.* 4. *An.* 1679. Which we may reaſonably ſuppoſe he would not have done, had he meant any Thing more by the *Supremacy*, than what he found in the Bishop's Expoſition of it. So that it is litterally true indeed, *that the Pope has ſufficiently declared what he means by it*, but in a Senſe very different from the extravagant Notion, you pretend to have of it.

ADVERTISEMENT.

After the Gentleman's *laſt Words in his* Caſe ſtated, *his* Lordship *is ſo complaiſant as to give all for granted. He only ſays, that, notwithſtanding the ſuppoſed extravagant Pretenſions of the Pope*, we ſtill keep Communion with him. *Which I preſume he was made to ſay only to uſher in the following Queſtions.*

§. 46.

Of Excommunications.

» *G.* MY Lord, is not *Excommunication* putting
» a Man out of his Communion? *pag.* 84.

L. Well, what then?

» *G.* Can then a Man be ſaid to be in the Com-

munion of a Bishop, who has excommunicated « him? *pag.* 83. «

L. No, Sr; if he be effectually excommunicated.

G. Then none can be truly said to be in Com- « munion with the *Pope*, who are excommunicated « by him every Year in the *Bulla Cœnæ*. pag. 84. «

L. 'Tis certain, Sr, that they, who are effectual- ly excommunicated by that or any other *Bull*, are not in the *Pope's Communion.*

G. And that is all *France*, and you, My Lord; « and all, who are on your Side of the Question « concerning the *Supremacy* of the *Pope*. For that is « the main, almost the whole Subject of the *Bull*. « pag. 84. «

L. Surely, Sr, you speak by Rote, and never gave yourself the Trouble to read it. For I do not find any one Article concerning the Pope's *Supremacy* in the whole *Bull*; nor any one excommunicated by it for Denying the Pope to be the *absolute Sovereign over all the Churches and Kingdoms of the Earth, their Bishops and their Kings, &c.*

But what better Proof can there be that *France* is not effectually excommunicated by the *Bulla Cœnæ*, than that all *Popes* not only communicate with the *Gallican Church*, and have their *Nuncios* residing at the *French* Court, but moreover acknowledge the *King* of *France* to be *the most Christian King*, the *eldest Son of the Church*, and *Protector* of the *holy See?* For, if *Excommunication* according to your own Notion be *Putting a Man out of his Communion*, do's it not follow that Communicating with him is owning in *Fact*, that he do's not look upon him as effectually excommunicated by him?

ADVERTISEMENT.

Inſtead of the Anſwer now given to the Gentleman's *laſt Words in his* Caſe ſtated, *his* Lordship *to ſhew his Learning tells him*, that all Caſuiſts agree, that an Excommunication do's not bind, which is made *clave errante. i. e.* by a Judge that errs. *To which the* Gentleman *anſwers as follows.*

» *G.* BUt who is *Judge*, whether the Sentence be » pronounced *clave errante*, or not? And how » far the Pope's Authority extends? *pag.* 84.

L. Sr, 'tis in the Buſineſs of *Excommunications*, as in all other *Penalties* inflicted by a Judge in the Exerciſe of his *Juriſdiction*. For the Caſe is either *clear* on one Side, and then it decides itſelf. Or it is *doubtful*; and then the Preſumption is generally on the *Superiour's* Side. However, as long as it remains undetermined, both Parties are juſtifiable before God, provided all Paſſion be laid aſide; and a ſincere Conſcience be made their Rule and Guide. Now, Sr, proceed if you pleaſe.

» *G.* My Lord, the *Pope* has excommunicated » you. All of you, *as if each one were particularly* » *named*. For ſo it is expreſs'd in the *Bull*. On the » other Hand you deſpiſe this *Bull*, and ſay with the » *Parliament of Paris*, pag. 44. 45. that he is there- » by excommunicated himſelf. And ſo you have a » Head of the Church, who is excommunicated. And » ſo of every Pope, who gives his Sanction to this » Bull. That is, all the Popes in our Time and long » before. And from whoſe Communion is the *Pope* » of *Rome* excommunicated? Is there any other Com- munion but that of *Rome*? Is a Perſon excommu-

nicated any longer a *Member* of the *Church*? And « can he then be the *Head* of it? Theſe are Matters « of no ſmall Importance; no leſs than whether we « are Members of the Church, or cut off from it. « You are cut off, ſays the *Pope* and the *Church* of « *Rome*. No, ſays *France* to them, you yourſelves are « cut off. And yet theſe Churches are the ſame. And « is there no *Judge* in this Caſe? Is every Man left « to his *private Judgment*? pag. 84. 85. «

L. Sr, I muſt beg Leave to put a familiar Queſtion to you, tho perhaps ſomewhat unmannerly. Pray, Sr, do's your Pulſe beat regularly? For I really fear you ſtand more in Need of *Phyſick* than an *Anſwer*. I have already endeavour'd to convince you modeſtly that neither *France* nor I myſelf are excommunicated by the *Bulla Cœnæ*: yet you will needs have us all excommunicated by it, even in Spite of the Pope's actually communicating with us. Then (to complete the Farce) we forſooth excommunicate the *Pope* in our Turn, and for Proof of it you produce the *Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris*: whereas to the Credit, Sr, of your admirable Skill in Quoting there is not a Word of it in the Piece, you refer me to, as I have fully ſhew'd, §. 19. And have I not then Reaſon to fear all is not well with you? For how ſhould you otherwiſe talk ſuch wild Stuff as this: *You are cut off, ſays the Pope and Church of Rome. No ſays France to them, you yourſelves are cut off.* Whereas every Body knows that *France* and *Rome* communicate together.

But ſuppoſe the *French Advocate* had been ſo mad as to declare the *Pope excommunicated*, would any Man in his Senſes take it for granted, that he was therefore *really excommunicated*? Nay and run Diſcant upon it, as if it were an undoubted Fact, and break forth into theſe vehement Interrogatories:

and from whoſe Communion is the Pope of Rome excommunicated? Is a Perſon excommunicated any longer a Member of the Church? And can he then be the Head of it? After which you conclude with a ſerious Air, *that theſe are Matters of no ſmall Importance*, and demand very gravely, *who is the Judge in this Caſe?* Why, Sr, the Parties on both Sides communicating with each other determine the Queſtion; nay every Man in his right Senſes will be ſurpriz'd at your Asking it.

» *G.* My Lord, how have we been teaz'd with » that Queſtion, *who ſhall be Judge?* This anſwers » all Objections with you. For begin at what Point » of *Popery* you will, and bring Arguments never ſo » convincing, we are always ſtopped with this Queſ- » tion, *who ſhall be Judge?* And ſo you refer all to » the *Authority* of the *Church*. But when you anſwer » this as to your own Caſe, you will have anſwer'd » it as to us too. *pag.* 85.

L. Sr, I muſt beg your Pardon. For I have already anſwer'd it as to my own Caſe: and you are as far as ever from anſwering it with Relation to any of your pretended *Reformers*. However I do not remember I have yet troubled you with the Queſtion, *who ſhall be Judge*, in Anſwer to your Objections: But have made a pretty good Shift to ſtop your Career with other Anſwers.

But let that be as it will, the true Meaning of the Queſtion you ſpeak of is this; viz. *Who has a better Title to be the Judge of Controverſies in Religion? The* Church of Chriſt, *or a* private Man *appealing from her Authority to his own private Judgment?* And let me tell you, Sr, the Queſtion thus underſtood ſuffices to confound any *pretended Reformer* of the Church's *Faith*. But the Caſe is quite otherwiſe as to the Queſtion in Reference to *Excommunications*, or Diſputes

about *Privileges*; as is obvious to the Reflection of any Man, who can diſtinguish between Articles of *reveal'd Religion*, and *Facts*, that have no Relation to it.

G. My Lord, if the *Pope* be *ſupreme Head* of « the *Univerſal Church*, he muſt have Power of Ex- « communicating over all in his own Communion. « That is, according to his Scheme over all Chriſ- « tians in the World. And to diſpute the Validity « of his Excommunication is a total Denial of his « *Supremacy*, and Setting up another *Supreme* above « him. And who is that? Who is *Judge*, whether his « Excommunication is valid or not? And by what « *Authority* do's he Judge? It muſt be by ſome Au- « thority Superiour to that of the *Pope*, and ſo he is « *Supreme* over the *Supreme*. pag. 85. «.

L. Sr, that the *Pope* has the Power of *Excommunicating* for a juſt Cauſe is as certain, as that *Kings* have Power to punish *Rebellious* Subjects. But pray, Sr, is it impoſſible for me to Judge that my *Superiour* is miſtaken in the *Exerciſe* of his *Authority* over me without Diſowning the Lawful Extent of it? Or do I become *Superiour* to him by Judging myſelf wrong'd by him? What wretched Stuff is this! I have heard of *Subjects* that have gone to Law with their *Sovereign*, and Sentence has been pronounced in favour of them: Yet I never heard the *Sovereign* has loſt his *Prerogative* or *Superiority* by it. But, Sr, in the Queſtion we have before us, viz. *whether France be excommunicated by the Bulla Cœnæ*, we need no other *Judge* than the *Pope* himſelf who has ſufficiently decided the Matter. For he knows the Bull has never been received by, nor has any Force in *France*: and therefore communicates (as I told you before) with the *Gallicane Church*, as with other Churches; he has his *Nuncio* reſiding at the *French Court*.

He acknowledges their *King* to be the eldeſt Son of the *Church*, and Protector of the *holy See.* What do you require more? Is not this declaring in *Fact*, that the *Gallicane Church* is not under *Excommunication?* Is it not declaring, that he Judges their *Profeſſion* of *Faith* relating to the *Supremacy* to be Orthodox; without which it is certain he would not communicate with them?

» *G.* My Lord, if the Pope's *Excommunication* » ſtands (without which his *Supremacy* falls) we may » ſay, who can be ſaved? All *Chriſtian Kings* and » *Princes* that are, or ever were in the World, even » thoſe of his own Communion, particularly in » *England* as well before the *Reformation* as ſince, are » all together *curſed* and *anathematiz'd* to the Pit of » Hell by the *Bulla Cœna.* And with them all their » *Biſhops*, *Divines*, *Parliaments*, *Judges*, *Lawyers*, » *Clerks*, *Printers*, and *Publiſhers*, or any others, who » have any Manner of Way been *Aiding*, *Aſſiſting*, » or *Conſenting*, tho tacitly to the *Contravention* of their » Princes to any Part of this *Bull:* that is, as I ſaid » before, almoſt every one above the Condition of a » Plowman, are here all damn'd by all the *Authority* » the *Pope* has. Therefore have a Care of giving him » too much. For he will take all any Body will give » him. *pag.* 85. 86.

L. Sr, all this has been anſwer'd already. I thank you however for the prudent Caution you give me not to be too liberal to the *Pope.* Tho you have ſet me but a very bad Example. For I aſſure you, Sr, you have given him more than the *Roman Catholick Church* ever dreamt of.

§. 47.

Bellarmin *and* Gratian *explain'd.*

G. HE accepted this from *Bellarmin*, that *if the Pope should command the Practice of Vice, and forbid Virtue; the Church were obliged to believe Vice to be good, and Virtue to be wicked.* De Rom. Pont. L. 4. C. 5.

L. But pray, Sr, was not *Bellarmin* put into *Bedlam*, when he taught this mad Doctrine?

G. Not that I ever heard of.

L. Then by the Grace of God we may hope he never taught it. So let us hear but the reſt of your Story.

G. Nay his own *Canon-law* ſays, that *if the Pope were ſo wicked as to carry with him innumerable People by Troops as Slaves to Hell to be with him for ever tormented, yet no mortal Man whatſoever muſt preſume here to reprove his Faults, becauſe he is Judge of all, and himſelf to be Judg'd by none.* Decret. Part. 1. Diſt. 40. Can. *Si Papa.* So then they muſt keep their Reproofs, and not endeavour to ſtop the Career till they are with him in *Hell*, and then I preſume his *Supremacy* ceaſes. Behold the *Machine* of human Invention, which God never thought of, nor ever once mention'd, of Climbing to Heaven by a Sort of *Mechaniſm* upon a Ladder of *Popes, Cardinals, Councils, &c.* And tho we ſee them leading us by Troops to *Hell*, we muſt give no Obſtruction, becauſe it would break their *Machine* of being our *Infallible Guides* to *Heaven.* pag. 86. 87.

L. I muſt beg Leave to adviſe you, Sr, that when you intend to be very witty, you forget not to ſpeak Senſe, as you have unluckily done this Time. For

deſire to know what is Nonſenſe, if this be not? viz. that the *pretended Machine of Popes being infallible Guides to Heaven would be broke*, if they were not permitted *to carry as many as they pleaſe to the Devil without Reproof or Moleſtation.*

But let us ſee, what Juſtice you have done either to *Bellarmin*, or *Gratian's Canon-law*, which you miſcall the *Pope's*. As to *Bellarmin*, the plain Meaning of his Propoſition is this. That if an *infallible Perſon* (as he maintains the *Pope* to be) ſhould teach the moſt impious Errors, we ſhould be bound to follow him: which mad Suppoſition together with it's Conſequence as ridiculous as itſelf do's no Manner of Harm, unleſs you can ſhew, that *Bellarmin* was ſo mad as to hold it poſſible that an *infallible Perſon* can teach the moſt groſs and impious Errors. All therefore that *Bellarmin* teaches is, that an abſurd Conſequence would follow from an abſurd Suppoſition, which is certainly true: as it is true to ſay, *that if a Man were a Horſe, he would not have a rational Soul.* And if I ſhould maintain this conditional Propoſition, would it be fair to charge me with Holding, *that a Man has not a rational Soul?*

As to *Gratian's Canon-law*, beſides that he is an Author of little or no Credit amongſt us, you have very much miſrepreſented his Words; if *Coining* one Part, and *Clipping* another may properly be call'd *Miſrepreſenting*. For you make it begin thus. *If the Pope were ſo wicked as to carry with him, &c.* Whereas the true Tranſlation of it is as follows; *If the Pope being neglectful of his own Salvation and that of his Brethren, be found unprofitable, and remiſs in his Duty; nay and moreover is ſilent when he ought to ſpeak; which is a greater Miſchief both to himſelf and his whole Flock: nevertheleſs draws with him, &c.*

Now, Sr, there is a Difference between this and

Saying, *if the Pope were ſo wicked as to carry with &c.* For this imports no leſs than a *deliberate n* to damn whole Multitudes: in which *Chime-*Caſe no Man ſurely is ſo mad as to ſay he might uſtly be reſiſted. Whereas the true Words of retended *Canon* import no ſuch Thing, but on- *Neglect* of his own and Neighbour's Salvation; *niſneß* in his Duty, and a *criminal Silence*, which occaſion the Loſs of many Souls; in which Caſe- s, he cannot be proceeded againſt *Judicially*. For Word *redarguere* can bear no other Meaning, plain from the Reaſon immediately added to it, *becauſe he is Judge of all, and himſelf to be Judg'd* e. However you thought fit to omit the Ex- on immediately following, viz. *unleß he be found ing from the Faith*. Which is *Clipping* a mate- art of the Text: and the Reaſon why you ſtifled lain, becauſe it utterly overthrows what you y charge us with, *viz.* that the *Pope* is free to as many as he pleaſes. Nay *Bellarmin* the moſt us of all *Catholick* Writers for the *Pope* teaches ſly, *that he ought to be oppoſed by Force of Arms endeavours to deſtroy the Church*. De Conc. Auth. L. 2.

ADVERTISEMENT.

n plain from the Gentleman's *laſt Words that he ſuppoſes the* Pope's Infallibility *to be a Part of our* Faith. *And his* Lordship *Saying nothing in Contradiction to it in the* Gentleman's Caſe ſtated; *he go's on as follows, under the ſame Miſtake.*

§. 48.

The Subject of Church-Authority, *and* private Judgment *reſumed.*

G. MY Lord, I muſt have ſome *Reaſon* to believe the *Pope* ſuch an *Infallible Guide.* And I cannot be more ſure of it, than of the *Truth* of that *Reaſon*, upon which I believe it. So that all recurs upon my *own Reaſon* ſtill. And if *my Reaſon* miſleads me in this, it is the moſt fatal Deluſion, becauſe it ſtops all Methods of Recovery, when I have once given to another the *Dominion* of my *Faith.* pag. 87.

L. Sr, you run upon a falſe Suppoſition. For you take it for granted, that the *Pope's Infallibility* is an *Article* of our *Faith*, which I never have allow'd of: and therefore your Arguing againſt it is but Beating the Air. However ſince your Argument ſtrikes equally at the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, or indeed at any Article of *reveal'd Religion*, I ſhall give myſelf the Trouble to anſwer it.

You ſay, *we cannot be more ſure of any Thing, than we are of the Truth of that Reaſon, upon which we believe it.* Whence you conclude, *that all recurs upon our own Reaſon ſtill.* I anſwer as before, that ſince all Faith is rational, I believe nothing without a ſolid Reaſon to build my Faith upon. But the Word *Reaſon* is equivocal: Becauſe it may be taken for any *Motive* or *Inducement*, for which I aſſent to the Truth of any Thing, whether that Motive or Inducement be *humane* or *Divine.* Thus if any one asks me *why*, or *for what Reaſon* I believe the *Bleſſed Trinity?* I may anſwer him, *becauſe God has reveal'd it.* If he asks me again, *why*, or *for what Reaſon* I believe, *that God*

has reveal'd it? I may anſwer him, becauſe the *Church*, which all the *Motives* of *Credibility* convince me to be *the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, has declared it to be a *reveal'd Truth*. And if you will needs call this *Recurring to my own Reaſon* in Matters of *Faith*, you may do as you pleaſe; for I cannot hinder you from Trifling with Words: Tho I ſhould rather call it *Submitting* my *Reaſon*, when it acts no other Part than to oblige me to believe a Thing, which I neither do, nor can comprehend.

However it follows hence that every Man's own Reaſon ſuffices to convince him, that he cannot rationally doubt of any *Myſtery* of *Faith*: becauſe it is not rational to doubt of a Thing, when we have a *moral Evidence* or *Certainty* of the *Revelation* of it. For ſurely our Reaſon cannot miſlead us in this: Nor need we fear the *fatal Deluſion*, you ſpeak of, in Truſting the *Dominion over our Faith* with that *Church*, which the ſtrongeſt Motives of Credibility mark out to us to be the *true Church of Chriſt*, with which all Truth is depoſited; and which he has promiſed *to lead into all Truth unto the End of the World.*

G. My Lord, the *Apoſtles* diſclaim'd this *Dominion*. For when they exhorted the Churches, they ſaid, *not that we have Dominion over your Faith, but are Helpers of your Joy: for by Faith ye ſtand*, that is, *by your own Faith.* 2. Cor. 1. ℣. 23. And *if we, or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Goſpel unto you; let him be accurſed.* Gal. 1. ℣. 8. Did not this make them *Judges*, whether any *new Goſpel* or *Doctrine* were preach'd to them? And our *Saviour* bid them ſtick to their own Judgment, and ſaid unto them, *Yea and why even of yourſelves Judge ye not what is right?* Luke 12. ℣. 57. And *if I do not the Works of my Father believe me not*, Joh. 10. ℣. 37. Was not this *Appealing* to their Judgment, whether he did

» the *Works* of his *Father* or not? And as many as
» follow'd their own *Judgment*, they believed in him.
» But they who were tied up implicity to the *Auth-*
» *rity* of the *Church*, rejected him. They ſaid, *have*
» *any of the Rulers, or the Phariſees believed in him?*
» *But this People, who knoweth not the Law are curſed.*
» Joh. 7. ℣. 49. pag. 87. 88.

L. I have already told you, and I repeat it again, that no Authority upon Earth is to be obey'd, when it has *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it; ſuch as the *Miracles* of *Chriſt* were againſt the Authority of the *Jewiſh Synagogue*. So that the People who follow'd *Chriſt*, Judged indeed by the Light of their own *natural Reaſon* aſſiſted by Grace, that the *Miracles*, they had ſeen with their own Eyes were an *unconteſtable Proof* of the Truth of his Doctrine, and that therefore no Authority upon Earth could oblige them to *reject* him. But when they had once form'd that Judgment, then they believed every Thing he taught with an *implicit Faith* according to the Direction inſinuated to them in the Words you have quoted from *Joh.* 10. *viz.* that, *if he did the Works of his Father* (as was manifeſt both to their *Reaſon* and *Senſes*) then they were bound to *believe* him. Which was not *Appealing* from his own *Infallibility* to their *private Judgment*, as you have the Boldneſs to affirm, but teaching them their Duty of an *entire Submiſſion* to his Doctrine.

As to your firſt Quotation from St *Paul* 2. Cor. 1. ℣. 23, Surely, Sr, you will not renounce your Reaſon ſo far as to ſuppoſe St *Paul* meant, that he had no *Power*, or *Authority* from God to oblige the *Corinthians* to believe the Doctrine he had taught them, or that he ſubmitted it to their *private Judgment*; and gave them full Liberty to *examine*, *change*, or *reform it* as they pleaſed. And if this be not your

Meaning, to what Purpoſe do you quote his Words? All therefore that St *Paul* diſclaim'd was a *tyrannical* or *arbitrary* Dominion over their *Faith*: that is, he would not have the *Corinthians* imagine, that becauſe he had been the chief Inſtrument of their Converſion to the Faith, he had a Power to impoſe any Doctrines upon them, or make them believe any Thing he pleaſed.

Your next Quotation from St *Paul* to the *Galatians* 1. ℣. 8. is as flat againſt you as a Text can be. But you have omitted a Part of it, for his Words are theſe. *Tho we, or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Goſpel unto you*, THAN THAT, WHICH WE HAVE PREACH'D UNTO YOU, *let him be accurſed.* Pray, Sr, did St *Paul* in theſe Words exerciſe no *Dominion* over the *Faith* of the *Galatians?* Did he ſubmit the *Myſteries*, he had taught them to the Examination of their *private Judgment*, when he would not allow it even to an *Angel* from Heaven, and pronounced thoſe *accurſed*, whoever they were, that ſhould pretend to *reform* the Doctrine he had preach'd unto them? And is not this a rare Text for *private Judgment* in Oppoſition to *Authority?*

G. But did not that Text of the *Apoſtle* make the *Galatians* Judges, whether any *new Goſpel* or *Doctrine* had been taught them?

L. Sr, it certainly made them Judges, that *new Doctrines* were not the ſame as *old ones.* But it did not make them Judges of the *Truth* of the *Doctrines* themſelves, which St *Paul* had taught them. Nay it tied them down to the Belief of every Thing he had taught them, and obliged them not to receive any other Doctrine even from the Mouth of an *Angel.*

G. But what do's your *Lordſhip* ſay to the Text from St *Luke* 12. ℣. 57.

L. I ſay, Sr, that it is juſt as much to the Pur-

poſe as the firſt Verſe of *Geneſis*. Our Saviour in the two or three Verſes immediately before the Text you have quoted reprehends the *Jews* for being very watchful in obſerving the *Seaſons*, and drawing Conſequences from them for their temporal Advantage, but neglectful in Diſcerning the Times of *Grace* and *Mercy*: and then he asks them, *Why they do not alſo Judge of themſelves what is juſt?* And is not this again a moſt admirable Text for *private Judgment* againſt *Church-Authority?* Is this Bidding the People ſtick to their own Judgment in Oppoſition to their *Paſtors* and *Teachers?*

Thus, Sr, you have trifled away no leſs than *five Texts* of *holy Scriptures* at once to ſupport a Cauſe, which, beſides it's being falſe, is really no Credit to your *Religion*. For in Shewing yourſelf thus zealous for *private Judgment* in Oppoſition to *Church-Authority*, and even Wreſting the *Scriptures* from their plain and obvious Senſe to maintain it, do you not plainly give us to underſtand that your Religion is entirely built upon the Sandy Foundation of *private Judgment*, and has the whole Weight of *Church-Authority* againſt it? For why elſe ſhould you be ſo fond of the one, and ſuch a declared Enemy upon all Occaſions to the other?

But can you be ſo prejudiced as not to ſee, that by it you undermine the very Foundations of all *reveal'd Religion?* Do you not ſee, that it opens the wideſt Gate imaginable for all Sorts of *Sects* to break in upon the *Church?* That it is the Source of endleſs Diſputes, and tears *Chriſt's ſeameleſs Garment* into a thouſand Pieces? I am ſure, when you wrote your *Chriſtianity demonſtrated* you were very Senſible of all theſe Inconveniences, and deſcribed the fatal Conſequences of *private Judgment* in the moſt pathetick Manner. And is it then poſſible, that ſuch an Evil

should

ſhould be either authoriz'd by *Chriſt*, or have the *Word of God* to vouch for it? If you now mean by *private Judgment* ſomething different from what you meant before, you only play with Words. But if you mean the ſame (as I am ſure every Body will ſuppoſe you do) you plead for a Cauſe, which you cannot maintain either with Truth or Honour.

ADVERTISEMENT.

After the Gentleman's *laſt Words in his* Caſe ſtated, *his* Lordship *ſuitably to the wiſe Part allotted to him, anſwers*, that it ſeems ſtrange, that God did not order it ſo, as that the Church ſhould have firſt known their Meſſias, when he came, and have declared him to the People, and then all would have believed in him. *Whence the* Gentleman *takes Occaſion to flouriſh in the following Manner, and triſle away a great many excellent Texts of holy* Scripture.

G. THe *Apoſtle* ſays, that *the Foolishneſs of God is wiſer than Men.* 1. Cor. 1. ℣. 25. And he gives the Reaſon in the following Manner. Why *God choſe the foolish Things of the World to confound the Wiſe, that no Flesh should glory in his Preſence, but he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.* And he applies this to the Caſe we are upon, to the *Revelation* of *Jeſus-Chriſt*, when he came. For, if he had been received upon the *Declaration* and *Authority* of the *Church*, we had gloried in the Church, whoſe Authority would have been *prior* and *Superiour* to *Chriſt* himſelf, as being the Ground, upon which we believed him. But as the *Sun* cannot be ſeen but by it's own Light, ſo *God* and *Chriſt* can-

» not otherwiſe be known. No adventitious, or bor-
» row'd Light can ſhew the original Light, whence
» all leſſer Lights are derived, which like the *Moon*
» and *Stars* diſappear at the Preſence of the *Sun*. So
» the *Church* diſappear'd at the Preſence of *Chriſt*,
» who was known by his own Light only. *We beheld*
» *his Glory, the Glory of the only begotten of the Father*
» *full of Grace and Truth.* Joh. 1. ℣. 14. Here was no
» Going to the *Church* to know which was he; or
» if you had, she would have miſled you. It would
» have been like Going to the *Moon* to ask where
» the *Sun* is? The *Church* is the *Moon*, and the *Stars*
» are the particular *Biſhops* and *Doctors*, and other
» eminent Men. But *Chriſt* is the *Sun* of *Righteouſneſs*,
» *and will not give his Glory to another.* pag. 88. 89.

L. Here is a Diſh of *Jargon* cook'd up with the moſt exquiſite Skill. Truly, Sr, as great Wits are ſaid to border upon Madneſs, ſo the profound Piece of Reaſoning, you have here preſented me with, appears to my dull Capacity to border as near upon what we uſually call Nonſenſe, as any Thing I ever heard or read. But you have larded it ſo finely with *Scripture-Texts*, to make it go down; and ſet it off ſo beautifully with the glittering Ornaments of *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, that I fear, I ſhall be thought impertinent to find any Blemiſh in it.

However I ſhall make bold to criticize a little upon it. *Firſt* you tell me (and 'tis the Groundwork of all the reſt) that *if Chriſt had been received upon the Authority of the Church, we ſhould have gloried in the Church, whoſe Authority would have been prior and Superiour to Chriſt himſelf, as being the Ground upon which we believed him.* It ſeems then the *Jewiſh Church* did well in not receiving *Chriſt*, nor Declaring him to the People, leaſt by ſo doing ſhe might have become guilty of the greateſt Impiety in making herſelf

prior, and *Superiour* to *Chriſt* himſelf. However ſeveral of the *Jews* believed in *Chriſt* upon the Teſtimony of St *John Baptiſt*: yet I never heard any of them blamed for making St *John Baptiſt's* Authority *prior* and *Superiour* to *Chriſt* himſelf. In like Manner after the *Aſcenſion* of *Chriſt*, the *Gentiles*, and many of the *Jews* before them believed in *Chriſt* upon the *Teſtimony* of the *Apoſtles*: for none of them had *beheld his Glory* upon Mount *Thabor* (of which St *John* ſpeaks in the Text moſt impertinently quoted by you) yet I hope that did not make the *Authority* of the *Apoſtles Superiour* to *Chriſt himſelf.*

But, Sr, I ask you, whether we may not believe in *God* and *Chriſt* upon the *Teſtimony* or *Authority* of holy *Scriptures?* If you ſay no: then *Scriptures* are no *Rule of Faith.* If you ſay we may, than according to your Argument we make Scriptures *prior* and *Superiour to God and Chriſt.* Nay, Sr, you told me a while ago [*Caſe ſtated* pag. 52.] that you received the *old Teſtament* from the *Church* of the *Jews.* And do you then *glory in the Jewish Church*, and make her Authority *Superiour* to the *Word of God?* You likewiſe told me [*Caſe ſtated* pag. 46.] that *private Judgment is all we have for the Belief of God and Chriſt.* And is every Man's private Judgment then *Superiour to God and Chriſt?* Truly, Sr, I begin to fear that neither *Sun*, nor *Moon* with all the *Stars* in the Firmament will ſuffice to give any Light to the dark Myſtery, you have advanced.

But you tell me *2dly*, that *God and Chriſt like the Sun cannot be known but by their own Light, becauſe no adventitious or borrow'd Light can ſhew the original Light, whence all leſſer Lights are derived.* But how then is *private Judgment all we have for the Belief of them*, as you told me a while ago? Why do you allow that to *private Judgment*, which you deny to the

Judgment of the *whole Church* with her *Bishops* and *Doctors?* Your Reaſon is, *becauſe the Church being the Moon, and her Biſhops and Doctors the Stars, they cannot ſhew us the Light of the Sun.* A very pretty Reaſon indeed! But, if neither *Moon* nor *Stars* can ſhew us the *Sun*, will the *Candle* or *Glow-worm* of *private Judgment* have Light enough to do it?

You tell me 3*dly*, that *as the Moon and Stars diſappear at the Preſence of the Sun, ſo the Church diſappear'd at the Preſence of Chriſt?* What, Sr, did the *Church* ceaſe to be, when *Chriſt* appear'd? On the contrary, t'is an unqueſtionable Truth, that the *Moſaick Law* ſubſiſted in it's full Force till the *Death* of *Chriſt*. For it was preciſely then and not before, that the *Synagogue* died, as *Divines* ſpeak. And ſo it may be much more properly ſaid, that the *Jewiſh Church* diſappear'd upon the *Abſence*, than the *Preſence* of *Chriſt*, and your pretty Similitude dwindles away into a meer Jingle of empty Words.

You tell me laſtly, *that there was no Going to the Church to know who was Chriſt: and if I had, ſhe would have miſtead me.* To which I anſwer, that when *Chriſt* began to appear *publickly*, there was no Need of Going to the *Jewiſh Church* to ask, *who was he?* For he was ſufficiently diſtinguiſh'd by his *heavenly Doctrine*, and the Luſtre of his *Miracles*. *Chriſt* himſelf referr'd the *Jews* to theſe; and by them they might have known him to be the *true Meſſias*: eſpecially if they had conſulted the *ancient Prophets*, and their own *Rabbies*, who had interpreted their Propheſies of the *Meſſias*. But inſtead of that they ſtudied nothing but to ſatisfy their private *Malice* and *Revenge*. And this alone was the true Reaſon, why *Chriſt* became to the *Jews* a *ſtumbling Block*, as St *Paul* expreſſes it. 1. *Cor.* 1. ℣. 23.

℣ *G.* The *ſtumbling Block* to the *Jews* was the *Au-*

thority of their *Church* againſt him, as I have ſhew'd. « And the *Gentiles* could not till after the *Reſurrection* « have any Notion of the Oeconomy of our Re- « demption by him, Nor was he preach'd unto them « till after the Viſion of the *Sheet* to St *Peter* Act. 10. « For the *Goſpel* was to be preach'd to the *Jews* firſt: « but when they rejected it leaning upon the *Infal-* « *libility* of their Church, then it was ſent to the *Gen-* « *tiles*, Act. 13. ℣. 16. who being free from the *ſtum-* « *bling-block* of the *Church*, received it readily, and « now make up the whole Body of the *Catholick* « *Church* throughout the World. *pag.* 89. 90. «

L. This, Sr, is the 3d or 4th Repetition of the ſame of Story; and the whole Force of it amounts to this. *viz.* That as the *Jews* were ſeduced by the *pretended infallible Authority* of the *Synagogue* (which however had *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it) ſo *Roman Catholicks* are ſeduced by the *real Infallibility* of their *Church*; againſt which no ſuch Evidence can be produced. And who is able to withſtand the Strength of ſuch an Argument?

§. 49.

An infallible Guide *is an* infallible Aſſurance, *tho* we *be not infallible ourſelves.*

G. BUt ſuppoſe *God* gave us an *infallible Guide*, « this would not be an *infallible Aſſurance* to « us, unleſs we were *infallible* too. For beſides our « not knowing him, or Miſtaking another for him « (for there have been *falſe Chriſts*) we might miſ- « underſtand his Doctrine, and turn it to quite « contrary Purpoſes from what he intended. This « was the Caſe in our Saviour's Time. He was a « *Guide* truly *infallible*, and yet how few follow'd « him notwithſtanding all his *Miracles*, and heaven- «

» ly Doctrine? Therefore while we are *fallible* our-
» ſelves, liable to Errors, and Miſtakes, in vain do
» we grope after an *infallible Aſſurance*, otherwiſe than
» the *Evidence of Things* makes them plain to that
» Reaſon, which God has given us. *pag.* 90.

L. Do you ſay ſo, Sr! Then we are not *infallibly ſure*, that there is *one God in three Perſons*, ſince there is no *Evidence* in the *Thing itſelf*, which can make this *plain* to *humane Reaſon:* Nay the Reaſon, which God has given us, is Seemingly againſt it. So that I doubt not, Sr, but the whole Body of *Deiſts* in *Great Britain* will vote you a worthy Member of their Society for this good and commodious Doctrine, which in Effect delivers us from the Obligation of believing any Thing, we cannot underſtand.

But what a ſtrange Paradox have you advanced in Saying, *that an infallible Guide can be no infallible Aſſurance to us: unleſs we be infallible too?* Pray, Sr, have not you and I an *infallible Aſſurance*, that the *Word of God* cannot deceive us? And do's not this make us *infallibly ſure*, that, for Example, all the hiſtorical Facts contain'd in *Scripture* are true? Yet I am far from thinking that either you or I are *infallible?*

You ſay, *we may miſtake our infallible Guide, or miſunderſtand him.* If we wilfully ſhut our Eyes to follow the Dictates of *Intereſt* or *Paſſion*, we may miſtake him. But if we will follow the *Lights*, which *God* has given us; the *viſible Marks*, that point him out to us, are ſo clear, that it is morally impoſſible we ſhould miſtake him. Neither can we *miſunderſtand* his Doctrine ſo, as not to know what he teaches; unleſs you ſuppoſe us to be ſo ignorant as not to know our *Catechiſms.* Am not I, for Example, *infallibly ſure*, that my Guide teaches me, that there is but *one God in three Perſons?* 'Tis true, I cannot comprehend this *Myſtery:* but I know with an *in-*

fallible Assurance, that I am taught to believe it. And the ſame may be ſaid of all other *Articles* of *Faith*.

You pretend, *it was the Caſe in our Saviour's Time, who tho he was a Guide truly infallible, was follow'd by few.* But can you find no other Reaſon, why few of the *Jews* follow'd him, than becauſe they were not *infallible* like himſelf? For if this was the Reaſon of it, then *Chriſt* condemn'd the *Jews* unjuſtly, when he told them, *if I had not come and ſpoken unto them, they had not had Sin, but now they have no Cloak for their Sin.* Joh. 15. ℣. 22. For truly, Sr, you have provided them a very good *Cloak for their Sin*: becauſe their being *fallible* Men was not their Fault. The true Reaſon therefore, why few of the *Jews* follow'd *Chriſt*, was, becauſe moſt of them were *rotten at Heart*: which is alſo the true Reaſon, why many now a Days ſhut their Eyes againſt the *cleareſt Light*: And to theſe indeed the moſt *infallible Guide* is render'd wholly uſeleſs.

G. My Lord, the *Angels* of Heaven fell, *Adam* « fell from his Innocence, and the ſeven Bishops, « who were the *ſeven Stars* in the right Hand of « *Chriſt*, Rev. 1. ℣. 20. and the *ſeven golden Candleſticks*, « the *ſeven Churches*, in the midſt of which he walk'd; « theſe are all fallen. And what are we, that expect « *Infallibility?* pag. 90. 91. «

L. If you had ask'd me, what are we, that expect *Impeccability?* Your Queſtion would have been to the Purpoſe, and I ſhould have had my Anſwer ready for it.

G. What *Biſhop*, what *Church* now is ſo *infal-* « *libly ſeated* as theſe *beloved ſeven* were? *pag.* 91. «

L. I'le tell you, Sr, what Church is ſo *infallibly* ſeated. It is the *Church of Chriſt*; the *Catholick Church*; in a Word, the *Church*, we profeſs in the *Creed*. This Church, I ſay, was *then*, is *now*, and will be

ſo infallibly ſeated to the End of the World. And the Reaſon, why notwithſtanding all this any *particular Church* may fall, is, becauſe the Promiſes of *Infallibility* were not made to any *particular Diocеſs*, but to the *Church of Chriſt* in general: As it is certain by Virtue of God's Promiſe to *Noah*, that the *whole World* ſhall never perish by a *ſecond Deluge*, tho ſeveral Parts of it have already been overwhelm'd by the Sea.

» *G.* Pray, My Lord, what Church has a Pro» miſe of being exempted from the *general Defection*, » which is foretold will be before the *ſecond Coming* » *of Chriſt*, when he *ſhall not find Faith upon Earth*? » pag. 91.

L. This, Sr, is the ſame old Story again: twenty Times repeated, and as often anſwer'd. But if you will needs have a direct Anſwer; the *Catholick Chriſt* has this Promiſe made to her. *Math.* 28. ℣. 20.

» *G.* May we not rather think, that the Plea of » *Infallibility* in the *Church of Rome* (ſo many Ways » detected) which hides Repentance from her Eyes, » and hinders her Return from any of her Errors, » which by this Means continually flow without any » Ebbing on any Side; I ſay, may we not think this » always encreaſing Corruption the chief Cauſe to » bring on that *univerſal Defection* in the latter Times? » *pag.* 91.

L. Alas, poor Church! How is she to be lamented, ſince the very *Infallibility*, which *Chriſt* has promiſed her, is the Source of all her *Errors!* How happy would she have been, had he never promiſed her, that *the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt her*, nor ever engaged his Word, *that he will be with her to the End of the World?* Math. 28. ℣. 20. For then there would have been no Danger of the *univerſal Defection* in the latter Days. But I fear I interrupted you.

G. Do's

G. Do's it not ſeem to haſten a pace, to be even « it the Doors, when we ſee no *Abſurdity* ſo great, « no *Text* of *Scripture* ſo full and expreſs to be too « hard for this *Infallibility?* pag. 91. «

L. Sr, juſt ſo *Arius* ſpoke, when his *Blaſphemies* were condemn'd by the *Church.* For no Man ever had a more plauſible Pretence both of *Reaſon*, and *Scripture* on his Side, than that vile *Heretick.* But what ſeem'd a *groß Abſurdity* to him, and contrary to the expreſs *Word of God*, was declared a *reveal'd Truth* by the *infallible Church* of *Chriſt.*

G. Nothing, I ſay, is too hard for this *Infalli-* « *bility*; not even the Denying all our outward Senſes « at once, and owning that we neither *ſee*, *hear*, *feel*, « *taſt*, nor *ſmell!* pag. 91. «

L. Sr, your Saying, that we *own* this, betrays either a groſs *Ignorance* or *Inſincerity.* For we own no ſuch Thing. On the contrary, 'tis a ridiculous Abſurdity; you conſtantly charge us with, and we as conſtantly diſown; as ſhall be fully proved in it's proper Place. But ſince you are in ſo good a Way, 'tis a Pity to ſtop you. So pray go on.

G. Not the expreſs Inſtitution of the *Lord's* « *Supper* in *both Kinds*, to which the *Council* of *Conſ-* « *tance* claps a *non obſtante*, and takes away the *Cup* « from the *Laity!* Not the Authority and ſtrong « Reaſoning of the *Apoſtle* 1. Cor. 14. againſt publick « Prayer in an *unknown Tongue!* All theſe are over- « ruled by *Infallibility*, and many more we have to « inſtance in the particular Doctrines in Diſpute « with the *Church* of *Rome.* In all which by Virtue « of her *unlimited* and *infallible* Power of interpre- « ting, she leaves no Texts of *Scripture* of any other « Meaning, than she thinks fit to put upon them, « let the Words be never ſo expreſs. And this in- « deed is no other than taking the *Scriptures* wholly «

» from us, while we muſt not read them with our » Underſtanding. And the Reſult of this is, that » the whole Foundation of our Faith is in the *Church* » of *Rome* without *Scripture*, or any Thing elſe: be- » cauſe the *Scripture* and every Thing elſe is put ab- » ſolutely and implicity in her Power, *pag.* 91. 92.

L. A terrible Grievance indeed! That the *Flock* should be fed and guided by their *Paſtors!* That ignorant Laicks should not be permitted to interpret *Scriptures* according to their own Caprice, but be bound to ſubmit to the Interpretation of their Superiours, and of thoſe, who are not only wiſer and more learned than themſelves, but expreſsly appointed by God to teach and govern them. *Act.* 20. *v.* 28. Sr, tho I had no other Reaſon to convince me of the neceſſity of Submitting to the Church's Interpretation of *Scriptures*, the forced and abſurd Turns you gave juſt now [§. 48.] to about half a Score *ſcriptural Texts* would alone ſuffice to convince me of it. But as to your Flirts at our Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Communion in one Kind*, and our *Latin Liturgy*, it will be Time enough to expoſe the Weakneſs and Injuſtice of your Reflections, when we come to diſcuſs thoſe Points in particular. For I aſſure you, Sr, you ſhall have full Satisfaction given you in every Point.

» *L.* My Lord, no Man alive knows, what this » *Church of Rome* is, or where to be found. I mean, » the *Church of Rome*, to which the *Infallibility* is an- » nex'd. For if you travel to *Rome*, you will ſee » nothing there, but what by a modern Diſtinction » you call the *Court of Rome*, where then is this *in- » fallible Church* of *Rome?* pag. 92.

L. Sr, it is the Church of *all Chriſtians* the whole World over, united in *Faith* and *Communion* with the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, who is the *Head* of this Church,

So that all *Roman Catholicks*, whether living in or out of *Rome*, are of the *Church*, but all are not of the *Court of Rome*. I think this Answer is precise and clear.

§. 50.

The four pretended contradictory *Schemes of lodging the* Infallibility *examined.*

G. SOme, My Lord, place the *Infallibility* in the « *Pope alone*, as the only *Heir* of St *Peter*, and « *living Judge* of Controversy; and therefore above « *Councils*, and the whole *Body* of the *Church* put to- « gether. *pag.* 92. «

L. Sr, you are always very lavish in bestowing *Titles* on the *Pope*. You have already made him the *Universal Monarch* of *Kings* and *Bishops*: And now you make him *Heir* of St *Peter*, whose Title never was *hereditary*, but *elective*. Let us therefore stile him St *Peter's Successor*, which Title he has by the *Election* of the *Church*, as he has his Power annex'd to it immediately from *God*.

However that be, 'tis true what you say, that many *Catholick Divines* place the *Infallibility* in the *Pope*. But no *Catholick Divine* in the World ever placed it in the *Pope* ALONE. Because the Word *alone* excludes both *general Councils*, and the *diffusive Body* of the *Church*, to which no *Catholick Divine* ever denied *Infallibility* in Matters of Faith. But this was a necessary stratagem to make your *first Scheme* appear to be a *Contradiction* to the rest. So I desire you to keep the Word *alone* to yourself, and then go on.

G. Others like not this. And because some « *Popes* have proved *heretical*, and have been cen- « sured and *deposed* for it; and others of them have «

» proved moſt wicked and flagitious Men, who be-
» ſides the Viciouſneſs of their own Lives have fill'd
» the World with *Blood*, *Rebellion*, and *Uſurpation*
» in purſuance of the *depoſing Power*, they have aſ-
» ſumed over Princes, for theſe and other Reaſons
» they would not have the *Infallibility* truſted with
» the *Pope*, but lodge it in a *general Council* as *Supe-*
» *riour* to the *Pope* with Power to reform, and even
» to *depoſe* him. *pag.* 92. 93.

L. Sr, there is one Thing ſtrictly true in this your *ſecond Scheme*, viz. That many *Catholick Divines* deny the *Pope's Infallibility:* and all theſe agree unanimouſly in placing it both in the *diffuſive Body* of the *Church*, and *general Councils* received as ſuch. But as to what you ſay concerning their Opinion, *that a general Council is Superiour to the Pope*, this is wholly foreign to the Queſtion we are upon. For whether that be true or falſe, I defy you to make good the *Contradictions* you pretend to charge us with in Lodging the *Infallibility*.

» *G.* A third Party approve of neither of theſe
» Ways. For as they think a *Pope* alone without a
» *Council* not to be *Infallible*, ſo neither a *Council*
» without a *Pope*, who is *Head* of it, and without
» whom there cannot be a Lawful Council, as no
» *Parliament* without a *King*. Theſe are for *King* and
» *Parliament*, and place the *Infallibility* in neither
» *Pope* nor *Council* apart, but only when both toge-
» ther, and Agreeing. But becauſe this will defeat
» ſeveral of thoſe Councils, call'd *General*, and ſplit
» others; as when the *Pope* or his *Legates* withdrew
» from the Council (like a King leaving his Par-
» liament) then ſuch was no longer a Lawful Coun-
» cil, but a *Schiſmatical Conventicle*; as was ſaid of
» the Council of *Baſil* and *Conſtance*, *&c.* And be-
» cauſe there have been Popes againſt Popes, and

Councils againſt Councils, and that the Requiſits « neceſſary to conſtitute a lawful Council, and conſe- « quently *Infallible*, are ſome of them diſputed, as the « Authority of *Summoning* and *Convening* the Council, « and *Preſiding* in it, and other Requiſits allow'd by « all to be neceſſary are impoſſible to be known with « any Certainty: As, that all the Fathers there met « ſhould uſe all Diligence to examine and canvaſs « to the Bottom every Point, that comes before « them: and that they ſhould be under no Terror « or Fear of any, nor biaſs'd by Party, Hopes of « Preferment, or Gain, or any other corrupt Paſ- « ſion, but doing all Things out of true Zeal to the « Glory of God, and Good of the Church; Other- « wiſe that there is no *Infallibility* follows that Coun- « cil: And this being impoſſible for any to know but « God alone, conſequently the *Infallibility* of all « Councils is render'd precarious, and no Certainty « at all in them: Or rather it is certain by the Hiſ- « tory of all *Councils* call'd *general*, that theſe human « Paſſions not conſiſtent with *Infallibility*, had an In- « fluence in all, or moſt of them. So that we cannot « be certain of the *Infallibility* of any Concil, unleſs « we are infallibly ſure, that none of theſe human « Paſſions had a Mixture in it. «

This makes a *fourth Party* in the *Church* of *Rome*: « that is, of thoſe, who place the *Infallibility* neither « in *Pope*, nor *Council jointly* or *ſeverally*, but in the « *Church Militant*, as they Speak. That is, the *Church* « *diffuſive*, or all Churches up and down the World. « We muſt then travel and learn. Here is a wild « Mark, and we are plainly left at laſt to *private* « *Judgment* to collect and compare, to approve or « reject what we find ſcatter'd in all the diſtant Chur- « ches upon the Earth. And no Man's Life or Capa- « city will be ſufficient to make the Enquiry in any « tolerable meaſure. «

» And now, My Lord, which of theſe *four Sorts* » of Infallibility will you take? There are three to » one againſt you, chooſe which you will. And all » theſe are of the *Church of Rome.* And what Diffe- » rence is there betwixt having no Guide, or one » you cannot find? *pag.* 93. 94. 95.

L. Sr, he that cannot find him, muſt be wilfully blind. But ſince you are ſo generous as to give me my Choice, I need not deliberate long upon the Matter. For the whole Body of *Catholick Divines* has already made it for me, and 'tis with them I place the *Infallibility* both in the *diffuſive Body* of the *Church*, and it's Repreſentative a *general Council* truly ſo call'd; that is, approved, and received as ſuch.

And now, Sr, I challenge you to make good what you tell me, viz. *that there are three to one againſt me, chooſe which I will.* Nay I only demand of you to produce one ſingle *Party* of *Catholick Divines* againſt me. They, who place the *Infallibility* in the *Pope*, will not ſurely be againſt me: for no Man in his Senſes will allow the *Pope* to be *infallible* by himſelf, and deny him to be ſo, when he delivers his Judgment at the Head of a *general Council*, or with the whole *diffuſive Body* of the *Church.* I am alſo ſecure of having thoſe on my Side, who (according to your 2d Scheme) place the *Infallibility* in a *Council* without the *Pope.* Unleſs you ſuppoſe them to be ſo void of Reaſon as to maintain, that a Council, which is *infallible* without the Pope, becomes *fallible*, when he agrees with it, and approves it's Decrees.

Where then is the *Party* of *Catholick Divines*, which you pretend to draw up againſt me, to be ſought for? Truly, Sr, you muſt be at the Trouble of travelling to *terra incognita*, or the World in the *Moon* to find ſuch a Party. For I am ſure it is not to be found in any Part of the known World. And

have you not then a great Deal of Reaſon to triumph over me as you do, as if I were entirely at a Loſs to know where to find my *infallible Guide?* Nay are you not bound to retract what you told me a while ago [*Caſe ſtated* pag. 63.] viz. *that there is no greater Difference and Confuſion among any Sort of Men upon any Subject whatſoever, than there is among the Divines of the Church of Rome concerning her Rule of Faith, and infallible Judge of Controverſy. And every one of the different Opinions about it is in flat Contradiction to all the others; ſo that if any one of them be true, all the reſt muſt be falſe?* Pray, good Sr, how can that be? Suppoſe I lodge the *Infallibility* in the *Pope*, do's that take it away from the *Church?* Or ſuppoſe I lodge it in a *Council*, do's that take it away from the *Pope?* Again, is it impoſſible for the *Church Collective* to be *infallible*, becauſe the *Church diffuſive* is ſo? Bus this, you ſay, *is a wild Mark, and we muſt travel and learn.* You may *learn* if you pleaſe, Sr; but you need not *travel* very far to inform yourſelf of any doctrinal Point taught by this *infallible Guide.* As for Inſtance; is there any Need of your going to *Paris*, *Rome*, or *Toledo* to know for certain whether the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* be taught in thoſe Churches? You may as well tell me I muſt travel to *Conſtantinople* to know whether *Mahomet* be Worshipped by the *Turks.* Now let us examine your Objections againſt the *Infallibility* of *General Councils.*

Firſt you ſay, *that in ſome Councils call'd general the Pope and Council have diſagreed. Popes have been againſt Popes, and Councils againſt Councils.* This is true in Relation to the *Councils* of *Piſa* and *Conſtance:* both which were oppoſed by *Benedict* XIII. and *Gregory* XII. two *doubtful* Popes before, and depoſed in the Council of *Piſa.* Theſe Popes had alſo their *Conven-*

tions againſt one another, which they call'd *Councils*. But did they diſagree either among themſelves, or with the Councils of *Piſa* and *Conſtance* about Matters of *Faith?* No, Sr. The whole Difference was about a Matter of *Fact*, viz. the *Validity* of their *Election*. And what is that to the Purpoſe?

adly, you ſay, *that in ſome Councils call'd General; the Pope, or his Legates withdrew from the Council:* And for this you quote the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, and conclude from it that then they were no longer lawful Councils. As to the Pope's withdrawing from the Council of *Conſtance*, the Fact is unqueſtionable. For *John* XXIII. withdrew privately from *Conſtance*, intending thereby to fruſtrate the principal Deſign of that Council, which was to extinguish the *Schiſm* by obliging him to reſign the *Pontificate*, as he had promiſed to do at his Election; in Caſe it ſhould be demanded of him for the Good of the Church. His *Election* therefore was only *conditional*; and his Eſcape to elude this End being a Breach of the Condition, upon which he had been choſen, he Juſtly forfeited his Title: but the Council loſt nothing of it's Authority any more than if the Pope had died. In Effect, being Soon after taken, and impriſon'd by the Emperor *Sigiſmond*, he was ſolemnly depoſed.

But the Caſe of the Council of *Baſil* is very different. For there the *Pope* did not abandon the *Council*, but by his Authority removed it to another Place, and was follow'd by the greateſt Part of the *Biſhops* and *Clergy*. But a few Biſhops, and many of the inferiour Clergy ſeparated themſelves from the *Pope* and *Council*, continued to meet at *Baſil*, and ſtiled themſelves the *general Council* of that Place: but was never regarded as the true *Council* of *Baſil*.

3*dly*, you tell me, *that the Requiſits neceſſary to conſtitute*

conſtitute a Lawful Council, and conſequently infallible, are impoſſible to be known with any Certainty. To which I anſwer, that the Requiſits to conſtitute a *Lawful Council* are as eaſy to be known by learned *Canoniſts*, as the Requiſits to know a Lawful *Parliament* are known by able *Lawyers*.

You have usher'd in your laſt Objection with a long Flourish upon the ſeveral *Paſſions* and *Defects* of human Nature, whereby Men are apt to be biaſs'd in their Judgment, and you conclude from it, *that we cannot be certain of the Infallibility of any Council, unleſs we are infallibly ſure, that none of theſe Paſſions had a Mixture in it.*

I anſwer, that if this will defeat the *Infallibility* of *Councils*, it will likewiſe defeat the *Infallibility* of *Scriptures:* becauſe they were certainly writ by *Men* ſubject to the common *Paſſions* and *Defects* of human Nature. For, according to your Way of Arguing, how can we be *infallibly ſure*, that St *Luke*, for example, who wrote the Life of St *Paul*, was not ſway'd by Affection, and that he is wholly impartial in his Relation? How can we tell that the Authors of the *canonical Epiſtles uſed all the Care and Diligence poſſible in their Search after Truth?* This is your Argument; and if it be good againſt the *Infallibility* of *Councils*, you have furniſh'd the *Deiſts* with full as good a one againſt *Scriptures*.

But, Sr, you do not reflect, that as a *blindman* following a *ſure Guide* can no more miſs his Way, than the Guide himſelf, ſo *fallible* Men directed by an *unerring Hand* walk as ſecurely in the Paths of Truth, as if they were *infallible* themſelves. Now when *Chriſt* choſe *Biſhops* and *Paſtors* to be the *Rulers* of his Church, he knew them to be *fallible* Men, and ſubject to *Paſſions:* And for that very Reaſon he promiſed them an *infallible Guide*, who ſhould govern

and direct them, overule all the Infirmities of human Nature, or even make them become Subservient to his own designs. Our Dependence therefore is not on the *personal Merits* of any Assembly whatsoever; but we depend entirely upon *God's Promises*; which can no more be defeated or obstructed by human Passions, than the eternal designs of his *infinite Wisdom* by the constant Vices and Follies of Mankind.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Gentleman *in his* Case stated *having Harangued from Page* 89. *to Page* 95. *without any interruption from his peaceable Antagonist*; *his* Lordship *at length breaks Silence only to proclaim the Victory of his Adversary, and owns frankly*, that he knows not where to find his Guide. *Which having done, he laments the Condition of Mankind in being destitute of an* infallible Guide *to conduct him to Heaven. Whereupon the* Gentleman *expostulates with him in the following Manner.*

§. 51.

Of taking up Religion *by Education, and how* Reason *is to be consulted in the Choice of it.*

» *G.* YOu may as well find Fault with the Creation. *Shall the Clay say to the Potter, why* » *hast thou made me thus?* Who was the *Guide* to the » *Angels* that fell? Who was Guide to *Adam?* Who » was, or who is Guide to all the Earth? To the » *Heathens*, to *Mahometans*, to *Jews?* These last stick » to their *Church* as an *infallible Guide*, and therefore » are most obstinate, and the most inveterate Enemies » to *Christianity*. p. 95.

L. Sr, they that ſtick to a *Church* as an *infallible Guide*, when that Church has *unconteſtable Evidence* againſt it, are only fit to be ſent to the Hoſpital of *Incurables*. And this has been the Caſe of the *Jews* ever Since their *Reprobation*, as I have already proved. But with your good Leave, Sr, it is not the Caſe of the *Church of Rome*, as you are pleaſed to inſinuate.

G. Who is Guide to *Infants* and *Idiots*? And « ſhall we interrogate the *Almighty* what will he do « with theſe, or why he created them? And perhaps « the greateſt Part of Mankind die before they come « to the Years of Diſcretion. And when they are of « Age, how few are capable to Judge, or have Op- « portunity or Capacity to examine the different « Pleas betwixt *Church* and *Church*, *Religion* and *Re-* « *ligion*? And do we not ſee the Generality of the « World take up their *Church* and *Religion* juſt ac- « cording to their *Education*? My Lord, if you and « I had been born and bred in *Turky*, we might have « been *Mahometans*. pag. 95. 96. «

L. Perhaps we might, Sr, and we might alſo have been damn'd for it, if being come to Years of Diſcretion we should have neglected the neceſſary Means of Coming to the true Faith. For let me tell you, Sr, I never read that *Education* was ever reckon'd by the ancient Fathers amongſt the *Marks* of the *true Church*: or amongſt the *Motives of Credibility* by any *Divine* in the World. Tho by your Way of Speaking one would be apt to think, that *Education* is as good a *Guide* as any under Heaven.

As to the Queſtions, you have propoſed concerning the Guide of the *Apoſtate Angels*, *Adam*, *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, *Jews*, *Infants*, *Idiots*, *&c.* I should be glad to know, what Reference thoſe Queſtions have to the Subject of our Diſpute. For the Queſ-

tion we had juſt now before us was, *whether I could find my infallible Guide?* And I think I have mark'd him out very clearly to you. In Effect, nothing is of Moment in Reference to this Queſtion but only to know, *who is the Guide to Chriſtians?* And this is eaſily determined. For there can be no other than the *true Church of Chriſt:* and the Pretence of having been educated in this or that Religion will be no Excuſe to thoſe, who, when they are come to the perfect Uſe of Reaſon, are capable of Examining, whether they be as truly Members of the *Church* eſtablish'd by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, as of the *Church eſtabliſh'd by Law*. For I preſume Religion is not to be taken up meerly by *Chance* according to the Place where we are born, or where we receive our Education.

» *G.* No, My Lord, *Truth* is *Truth*, tho all the » World ſhould depart from it. And there have » been Converts of all Nations and Religions, but » none, where Men cannot be perſuaded to over- » come the Prejudice of Education, and examine im- » partially for themſelves. *pag. 96.*

L. All this is very right. I wish it may hold. So pray go on.

» *G.* But *Infallibility* barrs all *Examination*. For » that implies a *Doubt*, and brings us to *private* » *Judgment*, and where then ſhall we wander? *p. 16.*

L. Sr, I ſuſpected you would not keep long in the good Way you were in. But, what is worſe, you relapſe into a Miſtake I have already confuted at large [*§. 36.*] for I told you then that the *Church's Infallibility* hinders no more our *Examining* the *Grounds* of our *Religion*, than the *Infallibility* of *Scriptures*, of which I hope you never doubted.

» *G.* Examination brings us to *private Judgment*, » as I told your Lordship; and you muſt apply to

every Man's *private Judgment*, when you mean to « make him a Convert to your Church. Why elſe « do you argue or reaſon with him. *pag.* 96. «

L. Sr, Examination brings us to the *right Uſe*, but not the *Abuſe* of private Judgment. For it brings us to a clear knowledge of the *Guide* we are to follow, and a full Conviction, that it is the moſt reaſonable Thing in the World to ſubmit our private Judgment in Things we do not underſtand, to the Direction of this Guide. And when we will make a Convert of any Perſon, we argue and reaſon with him to bring him to this Conviction.

G. Muſt he not then examine all the Arguments « and Motives, you give him for the *Infallibility* of « your *Church*, and Judge for himſelf, whether they « are well grounded, and will bear the Teſt of Rea- « ſon? *pag.* 96. «

L. He certainly muſt. And therefore we propoſe the *Motives* of *Credibility*, or *Marks* of the *true Church* to him, that he may examine them throughly. For they are proportion'd to the Capacity of every Man of a ſound and unbiaſs'd Judgment.

G. But muſt every Body then have *Reaſon*, and « examine but yourſelves? Believe it, then you are « in the moſt dangerous Condition of any, and you « are the Men, who receive your Religion by Chance « juſt according to your *Education*. pag. 96. «

L. That's very ſtrange, that we ſhould *reaſon* o- thers into a Belief of the Grounds of our Religion, and be ourſelves void of *Reaſon*. For will not the ſame Motives, with which we convince others, ſuffice to convince us too? And can we be convinced by them without Examination? You therefore talk at Random in Saying we receive our Religion by *Chance*.

G. Suppoſe any one ſhould return your own «

» Anſwer to you, and ſay, I will not examine, I am » infallibly ſure, and I will hear no more. What » would you think of ſuch a Man? Every *Enthuſiaſt* » will tell you the ſame. He will take his Oath that » he is infallible, and will hear no more than the » *deaf Adder* the *Charms* of Reaſon. But he will bid » you ſilence your Reaſon; for that is it which blinds » you, tho *Solomon* calls it the *Lamp of God*, which » he has planted in our Hearts. *Prov.* 20. ℣. 27. It is » the *Image* of *God*, in which he has created us, and » will be our Witneſs and Judge in the laſt Day, as » it is given us for our Guide here. *pag.* 96.

L. It is ſo, Sr. But you make a very ill Uſe of it at Preſent in Talking rather like a Man in a raving Fit, than one that is guided by his Reaſon.

» *G.* My Lord, inſtead of *Trimming* this *Lamp* to » make it burn clearly, we hear the general Cry on » your Side, *put it out, put it out.* We can't deal » with you till that Lamp be extinguiſh'd; it thwarts » us at every Turn, and ſtarts a hundred Objections, » that we cannot believe peaceably for it. But when » it is quite taken away (if that were poſſible to be » done) then you offer to ſhew us a *Meteor* of *In-* » *fallibility* (about which yourſelves are not agree'd, » nor know where to find it) which will keep us » from ever Doubting any more. As when a Man's » Eyes are put out, he cannot ſee a dirty Step, or a » Precipice before him; and then he is in that State » of *Security*, you propoſe. *pag.* 96. 97.

L. No, Sr, we propoſe no ſuch *State*. We deſire no Man to *put out his Eyes*, but we would not have him truſt them farther, than they can ſee. We therefore adviſe him to take a *Guide*, and be directed by him in a Road he knows nothing of, and where he will certainly miſs his Way, if he has nothing but his own Eyes to truſt to. For this is our very Caſe

in the Buſineſs of *reveal'd Religion*. *Reaſon* is the *Eye* or *Lamp* of Man's Soul, as you have juſtly obſerved, and *Faith* is the Way we muſt walk in during our Pilgrimage upon Earth. But the *Myſteries* of *Faith* being above Reaſon, 'tis a Way our Reaſon knows nothing of, and it will certainly loſe it's Way, if it truſts wholly to itſelf. It therefore ſtands in Need of a *Guide* to conduct it. But who is this *Guide?* For many falſe ones offer themſelves upon the Road; and all depends upon our chooſing the true one, which can be no other than the *Church of Chriſt*. But how, and where is this Church to be found? Here is the Difficulty, and Danger of Chooſing Wrong. For *Lutherans* ſay they are the *true Church*. *Calviniſts* ſay the ſame. *Anabaptiſts*, *Quakers*, and many more put likewiſe in their Claim. And yet there is but *one true Church of Chriſt*; as there is but *one God*, *one Baptiſm*, and *one Faith*; and there can be no more.

Here then (pray mark me well) we ſay not to Men, *you muſt not examine*. We ſay not to them, *ſhut your Eyes*, *renounce your Reaſon*, *put out your Lamp* (as you moſt unjuſtly reproach us) but on the contrary we exhort them to *examine* with all the Diligence poſſible the *Grounds* and *Motives* of their *Religion*. Becauſe theſe being the principal Enducements of their Embracing one Church preferably to another, if a falſe Step be made in this, it cannot but be attended with a Train of the moſt fatal Conſequences, and miſlead Men into the groſſeſt Errors.

Here therefore we bid them *open their Eyes*, and make Uſe of all the *Reaſon*, God has given them to find this *Church*, which is to be their *Guide*. Nay we warn them moreover, that in this Examination they muſt lay aſide all the *Prejudices* of *Education*, and give a deaf Ear to all the alluring Motives of *Inte-*

reſt and *Eaſe*. That therefore they muſt not conſider, whether the Church they are of, be the *prevailing* Church of the Country, where they are born: Whether it be moſt favourable to their *Liberty* and *Eaſe*; or finally, whether it be the Church, in which they are moſt like to make their *Fortune*; but whether it has all the true and eſſential Marks of the *Church of Chriſt*? As, whether it has always had a *viſible Being* ſince the Time of the *Apoſtles*? Whether the Doctrine it teaches has been confirm'd by undoubted *Miracles*? Whether the *Faith*, it holds, has been preach'd to *all Nations*? Whether it has had a *Succeſſion* of *Biſhops* and *Paſtors*; and a *Miſſion* derived from the *Apoſtles* themſelves, &c. For theſe, Sr, are the true Marks of the *Church of Chriſt*: Theſe point out to us the *Guide* we are to follow: And theſe we exhort all Men to examine, and inquire into by the cleareſt Light of that *Reaſon*, which God has given them: And would to God all Men would examine them with the Seriouſneſs and Impartiality, which the Importance of the Matter requires.

'Tis therefore falſe what you ſay, that we forbid People *to examine the Grounds of their Religion*. 'Tis falſe that the general Cry on our Side is to bid them *put out the Lamp of their Reaſon*, as if we were afraid of it's Light. On the contrary, as we defy any Man's Reaſon to find the Marks of the *true Church* on your Side, ſo every Man, that follows the Light of an unbiaſſed Reaſon, will find them all clearly on our's, and they will ſtand the Teſt of the ſtricteſt Examination, as I have fully ſhew'd. §. 36.

G. But, My Lord, tho you allow People to *examine* before they come to you, do you not oblige them to *ſhut their Eyes*, when you have once caught them in your Nets?

L. Sr, if the Meaning of your Queſtion be, whether

ther we oblige them to diſcard their *Reaſon?* I anſwer we do not. For we oblige them to nothing, but what *Reaſon* itſelf obliges them to. But the ſame Reaſon, which bids us examine the *Grounds* of our *Religion*, and enquire diligently into the *Marks* of the *true Chuch of Chriſt*, the ſame Reaſon, I ſay, tells us that we muſt obey this Church, when we have found it, and pay an entire Submiſſion to it's Deciſions. So that we follow *Reaſon* in the one as well as the other. Nay we *reaſon* ourſelves into an entire Submiſſion of our *private Reaſon.*

Pray, Sr, when a Man has choſen a *Guide* for a Journey, do's not his *Reaſon* tell him, that he muſt be directed by him? When a *Sickman* has choſen an *able Phyſician*, muſt he not follow his Preſcriptions? Or when an ignorant Client has choſen an *eminent Lawyer* to manage his Cauſe, would you have him diſpute Points of Law with his *Lawyer?* Or will he not act more prudently in Submitting to his Directions? Now this is the very Caſe between a Man's *private Judgement*, and the *Church of Chriſt.* Reaſon firſt leads him to this Church, with which God has depoſited all Truth: and then the ſame Reaſon tells him, that the *reveal'd Myſteries*, whereof she is the *Depoſitary*, being above his Underſtanding, he is bound to ſubmit to her in every Thing she teaches. And if this be not Acting *rationally* I known not what is. But how do you deal with thoſe, who are out of your Church in Order to make Converts of them?

G. We have no other Method with them, than « to *reaſon* on ſtill with them, and shew them, that « *Reaſon* is on our Side. *pag.* 97. «

L. The Method is very good, if you can shew it effectually.

G. Vaſt Multitudes of them have been con- « verted; even all *Chriſtian Churches* now in the «

» World, for all of them are of the *Gentiles.* pag. » 97. 98.

L. Sr, all the *Chriſtian Churches*, you ſpeak of, were converted by *Papiſts: Great Britain* amongſt the reſt. And I should be glad to know, what *Heathen Nation* has ever been converted by *Proteſtant Miſſioners.*

» *G.* As for thoſe, who yet remain unconverted, » or have not had the Goſpel ſufficiently propoſed » to them, we muſt leave them to God, who made » them, and will require from no Man more than » he has given them, but will Judge all People righ- » teouſly. Of this I have ſpoke before. *pag.* 98.

L. Yes, Sr, I remember your new-invented *Machine* of *uncovenanted Mercy*, and have deliver'd my Opinion upon it.

§. 52.

No Salvation out of the Catholick Church.

» *G.* BUt I obſerve, that ſince this Notion of *In-* » *fallibility* came into the Church, it has » rooted out all *Charity*, and her Religion has been » chiefly employ'd in *Curſing* and *Damning* all the » World but herſelf. Her *Councils* are tagg'd with » *Anathema's* upon every Occaſion, and you hear » little in them who shall be ſaved, but every Page » is full of who muſt be damn'd. And the *Bulla Cœ-* » *næ* pins the Basket, and leaves very few to eſcape » even of the *Roman Catholick* Communion itſelf. » *pag.* 98.

L. Sr, we have had enough of the *Bulla Cœnæ* already; ſo I shall only make ſome Remarks upon your Obſervation; which indeed is very curious. For if *Infallibility*, and *Curſing* with *Anathema's* came into

the *Church* together, then I am ſure *Infallibility* is full as ancient as St *Paul*; who curſed both *Men* and *Angels*, and *himſelf* alſo, if he or they ſhould preſume to teach any other Doctrine, than what he had preach'd. *Gal.* 1. ℣. 8. Beſides, Sr, the *Canons* of the 4 *firſt general Councils* are *tagg'd with Anathema's* as well as the *Lateran Council*, and that of *Trent*. And ſince your Church allows of the four firſt general Councils, and that, by Conſequence, the Church was then in her Purity, your Obſervation is an unanſwerable Proof againſt yourſelf, that *Infallibility* was then the Doctrine of the Church. Now, Sr, go on.

G. It is a common Argument, with which your « Prieſts frighten *Women* and *Children*. viz. *You Pro-* « *teſtants ſay, that it is poſſible for a Papiſt to be ſaved:* « *but we Papiſts ſay, it is impoſſible for a Proteſtant to be* « *ſaved: Therefore it is ſafer being on our Side.* But this « has turn'd to their Confuſion. For, as there is no- « thing in it but a confident Averring, it ſhews that « they have no *Charity*, which is greater even than « *Faith* itſelf. 1. *Cor.* 13. ℣. 13. And therefore that « they can be no *Chriſtian Church*. Their Want of « *Charity* being by this much plainer than our Want « of *Faith*. pag. 98. «

L. It ſeems then, that St *Paul*, and the ancient Fathers, who pronounced all *Hereticks* damn'd, were wholly void of *Charity*, and according to your Conſequence were no Members of the *Chriſtian Church*.

How void of Charity was St *Cyprian*, who wrote in the following Manner? *Whoſoever*, ſays he, *leaving the Church cleaves to an Adultereſs, is cut off from the Promiſes of the Church*. And again. *If it were poſſible for any to eſcape, that was not in the Ark of Noah, it ſhall likewiſe be poſſible for him to eſcape, who is not in the Church*. Cyp. de Unit. Eccl. St *Auſtin* was as

uncharitable as St *Cyprian*. For he wrote thus. *Being out of the Pale of the Church ſeparated from it's Unity and bond of Charity, thou wouldſt not eſcape Damnation, tho thou ſhouldſt be burnt alive for Confeſſing the Name of Chriſt.* Epiſt. 204. ad Don. And St *Fulgentius* was no leſs uncharitable than the other two; witneſs the following Words. *For neither Baptiſm, nor liberal Alms, nor Death itſelf for the Profeſſion of Chriſt can avail a Man any Thing in Order to Salvation, if he do's not hold the Unity of the Catholick Church.* S. Fulg. ad Petrum Diaconum. C. 39. Laſtly the *Athanaſian Creed* is moſt highly guilty of the Want of Charity, you accuſe us of. For it damns all, who believe not every Article it contains. And yet this *Creed* is highly approved by your Church.

Now as to the Argument you ſpeak ſo contemptibly of, I aſſure you, Sr, it has frighten'd Perſons of better Senſe than thoſe you call *Women* and *Children*. Nor has it ever turn'd to our Confuſion, as you are pleaſed to tell me. Nay common Senſe alone ſuffices to convince any Man that Salvation is more ſecure in that Society, in which it is allow'd even by it's Enemies, than in that, in which it is only allow'd by thoſe, who are themſelves Members of it.

» *G.* Take *Chillingworth's* Anſwer to it C. 7. of » his Works. *pag.* 306. *You* (ſays he to *Knot* the » *Jeſuit*) *vainly pretend that all Roman Catholicks, not* » *one excepted, profeſs that Proteſtancy unrepented deſ-* » *troys Salvation. From which Generality we muſt except* » *two at leaſt to my own Knowledge: And theſe are your-* » *ſelf, and* Franciſcus de Sancta Clara; *who aſſures us* » *that Ignorance and Repentance may excuſe a Proteſtant* » *from Damnation, tho Dying in his Error. And this is all* » *the Charity, which (by your own Confeſſion alſo) the* » *moſt favourable Proteſtants allow to Papiſts.* p. 98. 99.

L. I am ſurpriz'd, Sr, you ſhould give me this Anſwer of *Chillingworth*, and approve of it. For, if *Catholicks* allow Salvation to *Proteſtants* in the Caſe of *Ignorance* and *Repentance* only, and if this be all the *Charity*, which the moſt *favourable Proteſtants* allow to *Papiſts*, I cannot imagine, how this will agree with what you told me this very Moment, viz. *that we have no Charity, and therefore can be no Chriſtian Church.* What, Sr! can you *Unchurch* us for Want of *Charity*, and remain yourſelves *a Chriſtian Church*, when you profeſs to have no more *Charity* for us, than we have for you?

As for Mr *Knot* the *Jeſuit*, and *Franciſcus de Sancta Clara*, I cannot ſee they ſay any Thing more than what *Catholick Divines* commonly ſay; *viz.* that invincible Ignorance excuſes from the Sin of *Hereſy* as it do's from other Sins. Becauſe whoever is *invincibly Ignorant*, is ſo diſpoſed at Heart in the Sight of God, that if he knew himſelf to be in an Error, he would renounce it, coſt what it would. And ſuch a one is virtually within the Pale of the Church, provided he uſes all Endeavours poſſible to come to the knowledge of the Truth.

G. Militiere was perſuaded that King *Charles* I. « was happy in Heaven, becauſe he preferr'd the « *Catholick Faith* before his Crown, his Liberty, « and Life. Now it is known to all the World that « King *Charles* lived and died in the Communion of « the *Church* of *England*, which he declared with his « laſt Breath upon the Scaffold. But Archbiſhop « *Bramhal* gave him this Anſwer. *That which you have* « *confeſs'd here concerning King* Charles *will ſpoil your* « *former Demonſtration, that* Proteſtants *have neither* « *Church nor Faith. But you confeſs no more here than I* « *have heard ſome of your famous Roman Doctors at* Pa- « *ris acknowledge to be true in General.* And no more «

» than that which the Bishop of *Calcedon* (a Man, » that cannot be ſuſpected of Partiality) has affirm'd » and publish'd in two of his Books to the World » in Print, that *Perſons living in the Communion of the* » Proteſtant *Church, if they endeavour to learn the Faith,* » *and are not able to attain unto it, but hold it implicitly* » *in the Preparation of their Mind, and are ready to re-* » *ceive it, when God ſhall be pleaſed to reveal it* (which » all good *Proteſtants*, and all good Chriſtians are) » *they neither want Church, nor Faith, nor Salvation.* » pag. 99. 100.

L. Sr, I do not ſee, what Advantage you can draw from the *Biſhop* of *Calcedon's* Words. For he plainly ſuppoſes all *Proteſtants as ſuch* to be without *Faith*: ſince it cannot be ſaid of a Perſon, who already has Faith, that he *endeavours to learn it, and is not able to attain to it.* His Meaning then can only be, that *Proteſtants*, who endeavour, but are not able to come to the knowledge of the Truth, may be ſaved, if they be ſo diſpoſed in their Hearts, that they are ready to embrace and profeſs it, whenever God ſhall be mercifully pleaſed to bring them to the Knowledge of it. Becauſe whoever is ſo diſpoſed (which I fear is not ſo common a Thing, as you ſeem to imagine) whoever I ſay, is ſo diſpoſed, is *virtually* within the Pale of the *Catholick Church*, as I have already ſaid, tho he be outwardly in the *Proteſtant Communion.* And in this *Catholicks* generally agree with the *Biſhop* of *Calcedon*, becauſe *invincible Ignorance* excuſes from Sin.

As to *Militiere*, it is the firſt Time I ever heard him named. But I do not comprehend, how any Demonſtration ſhould come to be ſpoil'd by his Saying, that *Charles* I. (whom he ſuppoſed to have died a *Catholick*) *was happy in Heaven.* I am indeed but too much inclined to be of your Mind, that *Mi-*

litiere was miſtaken in his Suppoſition. But allowing that King *Charles* died in the Boſom of the *Catholick Church*, which according to his principle implies, that he was *inculpably ignorant* of the true Faith, he had all the Reaſon in the World to *think him happy in Heaven.* Nor could *Archbiſhop Bramhal* conclude any Thing from it againſt his former Demonſtration, becauſe he ſuppoſed the King died united to the *Catholick Church.*

G. Then no *Proteſtant*, at leaſt no *Proteſtant King* « need deſpair. *pag.* 100. «

L. Sr, neither *Proteſtant King*, nor *Proteſtant Subject* needs to deſpair, if you can prove them to be reunited to the *Catholick Church.*

G. But to the Divines I have mention'd, let us « add ſome Royal Teſtimonies. King *James* I. in his « *Premonition to Chriſtian Monarchs* tells us, that his « Mother *(Queen Mary)* as she was ready to lay her « Head upon the Block, ſent him this Meſſage; « *that altho she was of another Religion, than that, wherein he was brought up, yet she would not preſs him to* « *change, except his Conſcience forced him to it: not* « *doubting but if he lead a good Life, and were careful* « *to do Juſtice, and govern well, he would be in a good* « *Caſe in his own Religion.* «

This was perfectly agreeable to the Sentiments of « his Grandſon the late King *James* II. who often ſpoke « to thoſe Divines, who had the Inſtruction of both « his Daughters, to be diligent in making them Re- « ligious and good Chriſtians in the Way of the « *Church of England* without ſo much as hinting at « any Change of their Principles towards the *Church* « *of Rome:* as I have heard myſelf from two of them, « Dr *Turner* late *Biſhop* of *Ely*, and Dr *Ken* late « *Biſhop* of *Bath* and *Wells.* And neither before, nor « after his Coming to the Crown would he ſuffer «

» any Attempt to be made upon them as to Reli-
» gion; of which there is an eminent Witneſs now
» alive, who knows, if I ſpeak Truth. And when
» a certain zealot preſſed him to endeavour their
» Reconciliation to the *Church of Rome*, and offer'd
» his Service for that Purpoſe, the King anſwer'd,
» *no let them alone, they are ſo good; they will be ſaved*
» *in any Church.* pag. 100. 101.

L. Alas, that poor Prince did not then foreſee, that thoſe two *good Proteſtant Daughters* would ſoon after ſend their *Popiſh Father* and *Mother* a Begging. However that be, as to the firſt of your *Royal Teſtimonies* from King *James* I. I will not preſume to give him the Lie. But I dare boldly give it to the Perſon, whoever he was, that brought the Meſſage. For it ſeems it was not ſent by Letter, but deliver'd by Word of Mouth. And how eaſy was it for the Meſſenger to go beyond his Commiſſion, and forge the latter Part of his Meſſage; both to flatter the King, and make *Catholicks* appear to contradict one another; and ſo caſt an Aſperſion upon their Religion; which was a popular Thing, and the Way to pleaſe at that Time.

That Queen *Mary* should tell her Son, *that ſhe would not preſs him to a Change of Religion, unleſs his Conſcience forced him to it*, may very well be. But that she should add, *that he would be in a good Caſe in his own Religion, provided he lead a good Life and govern'd well*, is wholly improbable, and inconſiſtent with common Senſe. For either she was convinced in Conſcience, that her Son might be ſaved in the *Proteſtant Religion*, or not. If not, then she acted againſt her Conſcience in Sending ſuch a Meſſage to him; and that, in the very Moment, she was Going to lay her Head upon the Block: which cannot be ſuſpected of ſuch a pious Princeſs, as she certainly was.

But

But if ſhe was convinced in Conſcience, that her Son was ſafe in the *Proteſtant Religion*, then ſhe muſt have judg'd, that it was equally ſafe for herſelf: unleſs ſhe could think, that the ſame Religion could ſave one, and damn another. Now her Actions and Sufferings are a demonſtrative Proof, that ſhe never thought herſelf ſafe in the *Proteſtant Religion:* ſince ſhe choſe to loſe her Crown, Liberty, and Life rather than conform to it.

Add to this that *Sanderſon* a *Proteſtant* Hiſtorian, who relates every minute Circumſtance of her Death, and particularly a Meſſage ſhe deliver'd upon the Scaffold to her Servant *Melvin*, mentions not a Word of the Meſſage you ſpeak of.

I find the very ſame Improbability and Incoherency in the latter Part of your Story concerning King *James* II. whatever Vouchers you may pretend to have for it. For all the World knows, that King *James* ſuffer'd as much for his Religion as any Prince, we ſhall read of in Hiſtory. Nay all his Sufferings were attended with the moſt mortifying Circumſtances, that could give an Aggravation to'em. This renders it unqueſtionable, that he had a full Conviction of Conſcience, that he could not be ſaved in the *Proteſtant Church*. And is it conſiſtent with common Senſe to believe, that a Perſon under this Conviction ſhould ſay, *his Children would be ſaved in any Church whatſoever?*

You ſay, *he forbad the Divines, that had the Inſtruction of his Children even to hint at any Change in their Principles towards the Church of Rome.* But nothing can be more unlikely than this Story. For no Man forbids a Thing, but when there is ſome Danger or Probability of it's Coming to paſs: and King *James* knew very well, that the *Divines*, who were about his Children, had ſuch a mortal Hatred to *Po-*

pery, that tho he had commanded them to tamper with them, they would not have obey'd him. There was therefore no Manner of Occaſion to forbid them to do it. Nay he might as well have forbid them to preach *Judaiſm* to them as *Popery*. I believe indeed he never moleſted his Children about their *Religion*. For as he gave free *Liberty* of *Conſcience* to all his Subjects, it was not reaſonable that his own Children ſhould be the only Perſons excluded from the Benefit of it. But he could never be capable of ſuch a groſs Soleciſm in Practice, as to declare his Children ſafe in that Religion, which he had renounced himſelf upon a Conviction of Conſcience, that he could not ſave his Soul in it.

» *G.* Yes, My Lord, he might think his own Re-
» ligion beſt for himſelf without thinking thoſe in
» any Hazard, who were ſincerely of the *Church of*
» *England*, and lived up to the Rules of it. *pag.* 101.

L. Sr, when you convince me that King *James* was a *Latitudinarian* in Religion, then I ſhall be of your Mind, that he might think one *Church* beſt for himſelf, and another better for his Children. I am ſure he could not think his own Religion beſt for himſelf as to this World; and if he only thought it beſt as to his future Happineſs, he could not but have the ſame Opinion of it with Relation to his Children.

» *G.* However King *James* did not think it un-
» lawful to be preſent at our *Common Prayers*, be-
» cauſe he heard them at his *Coronation*. pag. 101.

L. But did any Man in the whole Nation look upon his being preſent at your *Common Prayers* on that Occaſion as a *diſtinctive Mark*, whereby he profeſs'd himſelf to be of the *Proteſtant Communion*, or that he therefore approved of your *Liturgy?* No ſurely. Nor can you conclude from what he did at his

Coronation, that therefore he thought it Lawful to be preſent at your *Common Prayers* in other Occaſions. For if he had, he might have kept the Crown upon his Head.

G. My Lord, what is Lawful once, is Lawful always.

L. I beg your Pardon, Sr. For the ſame external Action may be Lawful or unlawful as circumſtances vary. As for Inſtance: A Caſe of Neceſſity may oblige a virtuous Perſon to go into very ſcandalous Company, where it would be unlawful for him to appear at other Times. And the ſame Action may give great Scandal at one Time, and none at all at another. If I ſhould go upon Sundays to hear Prayers at my own *Parish Church*, where moſt of the Congregation know me, every Body would conclude I came with a Deſign to *conform*: becauſe going to Church in that Manner is regarded as a *diſtinctive Mark*. But if I went only out of Curioſity to hear the Parſon exerciſe his Talent in a Place, where I am not known, I ſhould give no Handle to any one to interpret it as a *Renouncing* of my own Religion. Ti's plain then that the ſame Thing may be Lawful in one Circumſtance, and unlawful in another. Now the Circumſtances of King *James's* being preſent at your *Common Prayers* were ſuch, as render'd it impoſſible for any Man to interpret it either a *Diſlike* of his own, or an *Approbation* of your *Liturgy* or *Communion*. Nor can you, by Conſequence conclude from it, *that he did not think it unlawful to be preſent at your Common Prayers in ordinary Occaſions*; as I am ſure no *Roman Catholick* thinks it Lawful.

§. 53.

Pope Pius *V. was not the Author of the* English Schiſm.

» *G.* MY Lord, formerly they thought it Law-
» ful. For after the *Reformation* the *Roman*
» *Catholicks* of *England* came to our Churches, and
» to our *Common Prayer without any Scruple.* And this
» continued till about the 10th Year of the Reign of
» Queen *Elizabeth*, when Pope *Pius* forbad it by his
» *Bull.* So that he made the *Separation.* And if he
» had not ſufficient Power to do it, or that there
» was not ſufficient Cauſe for it, then he made the
» *Schiſm* too, and it lies wholly at his Door. Now it
» is the undoubted Right of every *National Church*
» to reform, alter, and model their own *Liturgy*, as
» ſhall be moſt convenient; provided there be no-
» thing put into it, that is contrary to the *Faith*;
» which is not ſo much as alledged againſt our pu-
» blick Offices. They have a *Breviary* at *Milan*, and
» other Places different from that at *Rome.* And in
» *England* before the *Reformation* there were diverſe
» in ſeveral Dioceſes. As what was uſed in the
» Church of *Salisbury*, of *Hereford*, of *Bangor*, of
» *York*, of *Lincoln*, *&c.* as is mention'd in the Pre-
» face of our Common Prayer-book concerning the
» Service of the Church. But theſe Differences did
» not break *Communion*; nor did the Alteration made
» at the *Reformation*, till the Pope by the Plenitude
» of his *Supremacy*, and to be revenged upon Queen
» *Elizabeth* took upon him to break the Commu-
» nion. For which, as there was no ſufficient Cauſe,
» *our Liturgy being all Orthodox even our Enemies being*
» *Judges*; ſo on the other Hand the Pope's Supre-
» macy did not extend to break in upon the *Right*

and *Liberties* of any *National Church*, as has been, « and is ſtill maintain'd by the whole *Gallicane Church*, « and others the moſt learned in the *Church of Rome*. « And, My Lord, I know ſome *Roman Catholicks* of « Figure and good Senſe in *England*, who meerly « upon this Account have come over to our Church, « and thought themſelves obliged to return to the « Communion of their *National Church*, and to heal « the Breach made by that Exceſs of the *Pope's Su-* « *premacy*, which no ſober Man on this Side of the « *Alps* will own. It is ſtrange to own it in Fact, and « deny it in Words. Whoever owns this *Bull* of « *Pius* V. for Breaking Communion in *England*, « muſt alſo own the full Extent of the *Bulla Cœnæ*, « which has his Authority in a particular Manner, « as well as of all the Popes ſince. And it damns al- « moſt all *Papiſts* as well as all who are not *Papiſts*. « pag. 101. 102. 103. «

L. What, Sr! Will you never leave off Baiting that poor Bull? But we have now a Queſtion of greater Moment before us, to wit, whether *Pius* V. was the Author of the *English Schiſm*, which you boldly affirm, and endeavour to prove from a Fact, which upon Examination will appear to be a groſs miſtake. You ſay, *that after the Reformation the Catholicks of England came to your Churches and Common Prayer without Scruple till the tenth Year of Queen Elizabeth.* This, I ſay, is a groſs Miſtake, becauſe your Meaning (to be any Thing to the Purpoſe) muſt be, that either the *whole Body* of *Roman Catholicks*; or at leaſt the *moſt eminent Part in England* came to your Churches and Common Prayer; and that they did it upon a full Perſuaſion of the Lawfulneſs of it. For whoever do's a Thing *without Scruple*, unleſs he be an *Atheiſt*, is convinced in Conſcience, that he may lawfully do it. Now it is neither true, that the *whole*

Body of *Roman Catholicks*, or the moſt *eminent Part* did conform: nor that they, who conform'd, did it *without Scruple.*

I prove the firſt from Dr *Heylyn*, who writes thus (*pag.* 286. 3d Edit. *London*) *It was upon the* 8*th Day of May, that the Parliament ended* (viz. 1. of Eliz.) *and on the* 24 *of June that the publick Liturgy was to be officiated in all the Churches of the Kingdom. In the Performance of which Service the Biſhops giving no Encouragement, and many of the Clergy being backward, it was thought fit to put them to the final Teſt, and either to bring them to Conformity, or to beſtow their Places and Preferments upon more Tractable Perſons.*

In the ſame Page he tells us, that many of the Biſhopricks being vacant when Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown, there were no more than fifteen living of that ſacred Order. And of thoſe fifteen only one conform'd, viz. *Kitchin of Landaf*; who (as Dr *Heylyn* remarks) *having formerly ſubmitted to every Change reſolved to ſhew himſelf no Changeling in not Conforming to the Pleaſure of higher Powers.* So that no leſs than 14 Biſhops of fifteen refuſed to conform, and were accordingly deprived of their *Biſhopricks.*

In the next Page he tells us, that beſides the 14 *Biſhops*, ſix *Abbots*, *Priors*, and *Governours* of Religious Houſes (that is, all that were at that Time in *England* reſtored by Queen *Mary*) twelve *Deans*, and as many *Arch-deacons*: 15 *Preſidents*, or *Maſters* of *Colleges*: 50 *Prebendaries* of Cathedral Churches, and above 80 *Parſons* or *Vicars* were deprived of their Preferments.

But Mr *Rishton*, who lived in thoſe unhappy Times, and could not but know what happen'd, relates that great Numbers of the Layity, and many eminent Perſons of both Univerſities quitted the Kingdom, and choſe to undergo a voluntary Baniſhment ra-

ther than comply with the Times. Many alſo of the *Inns* of *Court* were turn'd out of their Places for Non-compliance. And 'tis notoriouſly known, that the few Religious Houſes, which Queen *Mary* had reeſtablish'd, as the *Nuns of Sion*, the *Carthuſians of Richmond*, and the *Friars of Greenwich* entirely refuſed to bow their knees to *Baall*; left the Kingdom, and ſought a Refuge in foreign Countries rather than conform contrary to the Dictates of their Conſcience.

Now, Sr, give me leave to propoſe a Queſtion. Suppoſe *all* the *Biſhops* but one of *Great Britain*, and many of the beſt Character amongſt the *Inferiour Clergy*, and *Laity* ſhould refuſe to take the *Oath of Abjuration*, I ask, whether in that Caſe it would be true to ſay, *that the Proteſtants of the Church of England take the Oath of Abjuration without Scruple?* Surely no. Becauſe when we ſay abſolutely, and without Reſtriction, that the *Proteſtants* or *Catholicks* of *England* do ſuch or ſuch a Thing *without Scruple*, the natural and obvious Meaning of it is, *firſt*, that either the *whole Body*, or at leaſt the moſt *eminent Part* do it. And *2dly*, that they do it by *Principle*. And how can it be ſaid, that either the *whole Body*, or at leaſt the moſt *eminent Part* of a Church do's a Thing, when all the principal *Heads* and *Rulers* of that Church refuſe to do it? Or how can the conforming Party, tho it be the greater in Number, be ſaid to do it *by Principle*, when thoſe, who are their *Spiritual Governours* by divine Appointment, their *Guides* of Conſcience, and *Judges* in Matters of Religion, declare againſt it both by Word and Deed? Since therefore all the *Catholick* Biſhops but One, all the *Abbots* and *Religious* that were then in *England*, and many of the moſt eminent amongſt the *inferiour Clergy* refuſed to conform, it is falſe to ſay abſolutely,

that *for the ten firſt Years the Roman Catholicks came to your Churches and Common Prayer without any Scruple.*

G. Your Lordship muſt own at leaſt, that the greateſt Part of the *Catholick Prebendaries* and *rural Clergy* conform'd.

L. Whatever they did, I deny they did it by *Principle*, and *without Scruple:* and unleſs they did it by *Principle* and *without Scruple*, your Argument from their outward Conformity for the Lawfulneſs of your *Liturgy* is not worth a Rush. For it will only prove, that the greateſt Number in Conforming acted contrary to their Conſcience. But let us once more hear Dr *Heylyn*. *The Biſhops* (ſays he p. 287.) *being thus put to it, the Oath is tender'd next to the Deans and Dignitaries, and by Degrees alſo to the rural Clergy: refuſed by ſome, and took by others, as it ſeem'd moſt agreeable to their Conſciences, or particular Ends.*

The *Doctor* is ſo modeſt as to leave it undecided, whether they, who conform'd, did it for *Conſcience ſake*, or *particular Ends*. But a few Lines after he explains himſelf pretty well. *But then* (ſays he) *we are to know withall, that many, who were cordially afflicted to the Intereſt of the Church of Rome diſpenſed with themſelves in theſe outward Conformities: which ſome of them are ſaid to have done upon a Hope of ſeeing the like Revolution by the Death of the Queen, as had before happen'd by the Death of King Edward: and otherwiſe that they might be able to relieve their Brethren, who could not ſo readily frame themſelves to a preſent Compliance.* I think we may modeſtly conclude from theſe Words of the *Doctor*, that the *Prebendaries* and *rural Clergy* he ſpeaks of, did not conform without ſome Qualms of Conſcience: unleſs they forgot the old Maxim, that *Evil is not to be done, that Good may come of it.*

But I muſt here obſerve to you, that the Oath mention'd by Dr *Heylyn* was the *Oath of Supremacy*, whereby

whereby the *Pope's ſpiritual Power* was utterly diſclaim'd. And this Oath was tender'd to all Perſons without Exception, that enjoy'd any *Eccleſiaſtical Benefice*, whereof they were deprived immediately upon their Refuſing to take it. Thoſe therefore that continued in their *Deanaries*, *Prebends*, or *Parſonages*, and conform'd to the new *Liturgy* to ſave their Bacon, had all ſwallow'd the Oath; and by that very Act renounced the Communion of the *Church of Rome*. They were not therefore *Roman Catholicks*, when they conform'd, but *Apoſtates* from their Religion. And all you can infer from their Conforming is, that they, who turn'd *Proteſtants* without Scruple, came to your *Church* and *Common Prayer* without Scruple, which no Man will ever diſpute with you.

As to the *Laity*, they, who had not Strength enough to weather the Storm, were forced into a Compliance by the Severity of *penal Laws*. And let me tell you, Sr, that when a Perſon conforms meerly upon Force, and go's to Church like a Bear to the Stake, it is no Mark of his Doing it *without Scruple*. However many among theſe to ſilence as well as they could the Murmurs of an uneaſy Conſcience, pretended that there could be no great Harm in a meer *outward Conformity*, as long as they remain'd ſound *Catholicks* in their Hearts. But they were vigorouſly oppoſed by others, who abhor'd this ſcandalous Trimming and Diſſimulation in Matters of Religion: and ſo the Caſe was ſent up to *Rome*, and the Pope decided it in Favour of the latter; declaring ſuch an *outward Compliance*, to be unlawful; as being a diſtinctive Mark of a *Proteſtant* from a *Catholick*, and a Denial of the *Catholick Religion* in Fact.

G. But was not then Pope *Pius* the Author of

the *Separation*, and by Conſequence of the *Schiſm*! L. Sr, he ſeparated, if you pleaſe, the *Corn* from the *Chaff*, and true Catholicks from falſe ones: as St *Paul* did; when he commanded *Titus* to *avoid the Company of an heretical Man after the firſt and ſecond Admonition.* Tit. 3. ℣. 10. And as he forbad the *Corinthians* to keep Company with Scandalous Sinners. 1. *Cor.* 5. ℣. 11. But as to the *Separation*, or *Schiſm* between the *Church of England* and the *Church of Rome*, how could Pope *Pius* be the Author of a Separation, which had been made ten Years before he ſent his *Bull?* For when Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown, she found the *Church of England* perfectly reconciled and united to the *Church of Rome*; and in the firſt Year of her Reign she diſſolved that happy Union, undid every Thing her Predeceſſor had done, deveſted the Pope of his *ſpiritual Supremacy*, and broke all Communication with the *Church of Rome.* All this, I ſay, she did in the very firſt Year of her Reign. And if this was not making the *Separation* of the *Church of England* from the *Church of Rome*, both Words and Actions muſt loſe their natural Meaning.

Pray hear what Dr *Heylyn* ſays upon this Subject. *When the Act of Supremacy came to be debated, it ſeem'd to be a Thing abhorrent even in Nature and Polity, that a Woman ſhould be declared to be the Supreme Head on Earth of the* Church *of* England. *But thoſe of the reform'd Party meant nothing leſs than to contend about Words and Phraſes, ſo they might gain the Point they aim'd at, which was the Stripping the Pope of all his Authority in theſe Dominions.* pag. 280.

This then was the Point they aim'd at, *viz.* The *Renouncing* and *Abjuring* the Pope's *Spiritual Power* in *England.* And this Point was effectually carried, tho but by the Majority of two or three Votes in

that very *Parliament*, which was the first of Queen *Elizabeth*. And therefore as the *Parliament* in Queen *Mary's* Reign reunited the *Church of England* to the *Church of Rome* by Owning the Pope's *Supremacy*, so this very *Parliament* of Queen *Elizabeth* separated the *Church of England* from the *Church of Rome* by renouncing the same *Supremacy*.

But pray, Sr, let me ask you, whether after this Act of Parliament, wherein the Pope was thrown off, the *Church of England* was in *Communion* with the Bishop and *Church of Rome?* This, Sr, is a puz'ling Question. Because you cannot be so void of Reason as to say she was: And if she was not, as it is certain she was not, then her *Communion* with the *Church of Rome* was broke by the Queen and Parliament. And is it not then ridiculous to say, that *Pope Pius* made the *Separation* and *Schism* by a *Bull* sent full ten Years after the Breach had been so effectually made? Really, Sr, I cannot but wonder that a Man of your Sense and Learning should undertake such a defenceless Cause.

As to what you say, *that your Liturgy is all Orthodox even your Enemies being Judges*, I should be glad to know what *Roman Catholick Divine* ever gave his Approbation of it. I am sure I never heard of any. Nay, if it were worth my Pains, I could mark you out several Parts of it, which would never be acquitted by a *Popish Jury*, nor found Orthodox *your Enemies being Judges*.

What you have alledg'd concerning the Diversity of *Breviaries* or *Missals*, that were in *England* before the pretended Reformation, or are still in Use in our Churches, makes nothing against us. For besides that they are approved by publick Authority, they all agree in every *essential* Point of *Worship*. Nor do they contain the least Word contrary

to *Faith*, or *Omiſſion* in favour of *Hereſy*. And therefore 'tis no Wonder, that this Diverſity should cauſe no Breach of Communion. Whereas your Liturgy is guilty of both, *if we be Judges.*

But ſuppoſe your *Liturgy* were all *Orthodox*, that would not juſtify our being preſent at it, unleſs your 39 *Articles* were likewiſe *Orthodox*. Becauſe we do not think it lawful to communicate in *publick Prayers* and *Sacraments* with any but thoſe, with whom we alſo communicate in *Faith*. Whence it follows, that Pope *Pius* had ſufficient Cauſe to forbid our coming to your Churches. And as to his *Power* or *Authority* to do it, you will have a hard Task to make good your Plea againſt him, unleſs you can prove either from the *Word of God*, or the *Practice* of *Antiquity*, than Queen *Elizabeth* had a better Title to the *ſpiritual Supremacy* over Chriſt's Myſtical Body in *England*, than the *Succeſſors* of St *Peter*, who had held it for the Space of 900 Years by a Title never conteſted till the 23th of *Henry* VIII. And then only in Order to bring about the moſt unjuſt, and ſcandalous Deſign.

G. But, My Lord, has not every *National Church* an undoubted Right to *reform*, *alter*, and *model* their *Liturgy*, as they pleaſe? And is not this maintain'd by the whole *Gallicane Church?* Or has the Pope a Right to break in upon the *Rights* and *Liberties* of any *National Church?*

L. No, Sr, he has not, provided thoſe *Rights* and *Liberties* be not only well grounded, but alſo maintain'd within their *juſt Bounds*, as we muſt ſuppoſe the *Gallicane Church* do's; ſince we hear of no Breach of Communion between her, and the *Church of Rome.* But if the *Gallicane Church* should pretend to reform her *Liturgy*, as the *Church of England* did in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, to the Prejudice of the *publick*

Faith and *Diſcipline* of the Church, you might then freely reckon them amongſt your *Proteſtant* Brethren. For I am ſure the *Church of Rome* would not own them for her Children, nor her King for the *eldeſt Son* of the *Church*, as she now do's. I therefore anſwer your firſt Queſtion directly, that no *National Church* has a Right to *reform*, *alter*, or *Model* her *Liturgy* to the Prejudice of the *publick Faith*, for the Encouragement of *Hereſy*, or in Oppoſition to *Canons* univerſally received.

As to what you ſay, *that you know ſome Roman Catholicks of Figure, and good Senſe, who thought themſelves bound to return to the Communion of their National Church:* The Perſons, you ſpeak of, may be Men of *Figure*, but I very much queſtion their *good Senſe*, unleſs you mean the *Senſe of Flesh and Blood*, which is generally moſt prevalent in Men of *Figure:* Becauſe they have the moſt to loſe by our Religion, and are moſt like to gain by conforming to yours.

G. But, My Lord, do any of thoſe, that have once left your Communion, ever return to it? And if they do not, do's not that shew, they are fully ſatisfied?

L. They, Sr, who change for *Intereſt*, *Liberty*, and *Eaſe*, cannot but be fully ſatisfied to find all theſe charming Advantages in your Communion, and will not eaſily come back for the Sake of *Perſecutions*, *Reſtraints*, and *Penance*. However many have come back, particularly upon the Approach of Death, when Men are ſerious, if ever, and all worldly Motives give Place to that of ſecuring their Souls. And 'tis a remarkable Obſervation, which I deſire you to take Notice of, that whereas Thouſands, who have been brought up *Proteſtants* from their *Infancy*, have deſired to die *Roman Catholicks*,

I defy you to name me one ſingle Perſon, who having been brought up a *Roman Catholick* from a *Child*, ever turn'd *Proteſtant* upon his *Death-bed*.

G. And what do's your Lordship conclude from thence?

L. I conclude from it, that *Popery* is the ſafeſt Religion to die in, *even our Enemies being Judges*. And if it be the ſafeſt Religion to die in, one needs not the Wit of an *Ariſtotle* to conclude, it is alſo the ſafeſt to live in.

ADVERTISEMENT.

After the Gentleman's *laſt Words in his* Caſe ſtated, *pag.* 103. *there is a little Scuffle betwixt him and his* Lordship *about the Word* Papiſt, *and* Roman Catholick. *His* Lordship *likes neither the one, nor the other, and will only be call'd* Catholick *abſolutely. The* Gentleman *lays Claim to the ſame Title for his Church, and diſcourſes as follows.*

§. 54.

Proteſtants *are no Part of the* Catholick Church.

» *G.* WE call ourſelves *Catholicks* too, and in » the ſame Senſe, and pray every Day » for the *Catholick Church* in our *Liturgy*. Therefore » we call not you *Catholicks*, becauſe it would not » diſtinguish you from us: But *Roman Catholicks* is » calling a Part of the whole. *pag.* 103. 104.

L. You need not be afraid, Sr, that Calling us *Catholicks* will not diſtinguish us from you, or any *Proteſtant Church* in *Europe*. For go to what Country you pleaſe, where there is a Mixture of *Roman Ca-*

tholicks and *Proteſtants*, and we are perfectly well known by the Name of *Catholicks*; I know this to be true in *Holland* by my own Experience, where if a Stranger asks the firſt *Proteſtant* he meets with, where the *Catholick* Church is, he will never direct him to his own Church, but to ſome *Popiſh Chappel.*

The like Obſervation was made near 1300 Years ago by St *Auſtin* writing thus in his Book *de vera Rel.* C. 7. *We muſt hold* (ſays he) *the Chriſtian Religion, and the Communion of that Church, which is Catholick, and is not only call'd ſo by her own Children, but by all her Enemies. For Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, whether they will or no, when they ſpeak not to their own People, but to Strangers, call Catholicks* Catholicks *only. For they cannot be underſtood, if they give them not that Name, which all the World gives them.*

Now I am ſure St *Auſtin* was no other than a *Roman Catholick*, as appears from his following Words *contra Epiſt. fund.* C. 4. *Thirdly*, ſays he, *a Succeſſion of Biſhops deſcending from the See of St* Peter, *to whom Chriſt after his Reſurrection committed his Flock, holds me in the Church.* Then he proceeds to the ſame Obſervation upon the Word *Catholick* as before. *Laſtly* (ſays he) *the very Name of Catholick holds me: of which this Church alone has not without Reaſon ſo kept the Poſſeſſion, that tho all Hereticks deſire to be call'd Catholicks* [pray, Sr, mind this] *yet if a Stranger asks them, where Catholicks meet, none of the Hereticks dare point out his own Houſe or Church.*

Thus, Sr, it has been the vain Ambition of *Hereticks* in all Ages to be ſtiled *Catholicks*, in Order to cover the Infamy of their *new-broach'd* Doctrines, and *upſtart Church* with that honourable Title. But Truth and good Senſe have always prevail'd: Their Efforts have proved vain; and they never were able

to gain it to themſelves, or diſpoſſeſs the legal Owners of it.

However let us examine the Thing ſeriouſly, and go fairly and plainly to the Bottom of the Cauſe. Pray, Sr, what do's the Word *Catholick* mean?

G. Why, My Lord, 'tis a *Greek* Word, and ſignifies *Univerſal.*

L. Very right, Sr. And you know there is a twofold *Univerſality* belonging to the *Church of Chriſt.* Viz. *Univerſality* of *Time*, and *Univerſality* of *Place.* And therefore 'tis ridiculous for any Church to aſſume to herſelf the Title of *Catholick*, unleſs she can shew, that the *Faith* she profeſſes is univerſal both as to *Time* and *Place.* Now then let us conſider, whether the *Faith* of the *Church of England* (as it differs from *Popery*) can be call'd univerſal either as to *Time* or *Place.*

The Church's *Univerſality* in Reſpect of *Place* muſt certainly be underſtood in a limited Senſe; or it will follow, that Chriſt never had a *Catholick Church* upon Earth: Becauſe there never yet was a Time, wherein her Communion was ſo univerſally received by the whole World, but that great Numbers of *Hereticks*, and ſeveral *heathen Nations* were out of it. Yet in Scripture-Language both of the Old and New Teſtament she is ſtiled the *Church of all Nations. Firſt*, becauſe she is the great Body of Chriſtians, from whence all went forth, as I have fully proved before. And *2dly*, becauſe she either has been, or will be in every Nation of the World. *That ſo all Nations may be bleſſed in the Seed of Abraham* according to the Promiſe made to him, *Gen.* 22. ℣. 17. 18. and the Prophecy of *Iſaiah* 49. ℣. 6. *and* 54. ℣. 1. 2. 3.

This, Sr, is the true Meaning of the Church's *Univerſality* in Reſpect of *Place.* But her Univerſality in Reſpect of *Time* is without Limitation. That is,

is, it ſuffices not, that she be the Church of many Ages, as the *Arians* and *Neſtorians* have been ever ſince the 4th Century, but it imports, that she has been the Church of *all Ages* ſince the Time of the *Apoſtles*. Whence it follows that *Catholicks* truly ſo call'd are the ſtanding Body of Chriſtians throughout all Ages, from which all Chriſtian Societies of *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks* have been cut off, as ſo many Branches from the Body of a Tree, which continues ſtanding and Growing, whatever Branches are lopt off from it.

Now, Sr, let us ſee, whether the *Church of England* can make good her Claim to *Univerſality* either of *Time* or *Place*: Is she the great Body of Chriſtians, from which all *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks* went forth ever ſince the Time of the *Apoſtles*? Alas, she came into the World near 1500 Years too late for that. Can she be ſtiled the Church of *all Nations*? she, I ſay, who but a little more than a 160 Years ago was not the Church of any one Nation in the World? Have the 39 *Articles*, which contain a Profeſſion of her Faith, been ever preach'd in *France*, *Italy*, *Spain*, or any Nation under the Sun, but what belongs to the Crown of *Great Britain*? No Man is ſo mad as to ſay they have.

'Tis then a plain Caſe, that she has no *Univerſality* of *Place* even in the *limited* Senſe, in which it is always underſtood. And as to *Univerſality* of *Time* (which from the very firſt Preaching of the Goſpel is without Limitation) she may as well pretend to date her *Faith* and *Religion* from the time of *Noah*, as from the time of the *Apoſtles*. For how is it poſſible she should? Since *Popery* was in Poſſeſſion of the whole Kingdom of *England* for 900 Years before the Reformation: Nay and the Book of *Homilies* declares *that whole Chriſtendom was drown'd in abo-*

minable Idolatry (meaning *Popery*) during that whole Space of Time. And where then was the *Proteſtant Church of England* all that Time? Where was her Doctrine of the 39 Articles in thoſe 9 Centuries? Where was her Succeſſion of *Proteſtant Biſhops*, whilſt the *Proteſtant* Religion had no Being? Was ſhe a *Chriſtian Church*, and yet in no Part of *Chriſtendom*? For in *Chriſtendom* I am ſure ſhe could not be, becauſe *whole Chriſtendom was drown'd in Popery* even *our Enemies being Judges*. The plain Truth then of the Matter is, ſhe had no Being at all till about the Middle of the 16th Century, and ſhe wants about 1500 Years of *Univerſality* of *Time*. So that you may as well ſtile yourſelves *Antediluvians*, as *Catholicks*. Nay you cannot ſay, you believe the *Catholick Church*, or pray for her, as you ſay you do in your *Liturgy*, without Bantering Almighty God.

G. But, My Lord, how can your Church be the *Catholick Church* properly ſpeaking, ſince you are not call'd *Catholicks* abſolutely, but only *Roman Catholicks*, which is but a Part of the Whole?

L. Sr, if by *Roman Catholicks* you only mean thoſe, who belong to the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, they are but a Part of the Whole. But this is not our Meaning, but your darling Equivocation. On the Contrary, we mean the whole *diffuſive Body* of *Chriſtians*, which is in Communion with the *Succeſſor* of St *Peter* (who actually is, and has always been *Biſhop* of *Rome*) and is therefore call'd the *Roman Catholick Church*.

» *G.* If this be the Frame of the *Catholick Church* » it muſt have been ſo always. *pag.* 104.

L. Sr, the eſſential Frame of the *Catholick Church* has always been the ſame: and no particular Church has ever been a Part of the *Catholick Church*, if it was not in Communion either with St *Peter*, or his *Succeſſors*, who have always been *Biſhops of Rome*.

G. Pray then, My Lord, tell me, what particular Church was ſo call'd in this Senſe, before there was a *Chriſtian* in *Rome?* And how that Church came to loſe it? And how was it tranſlated to *Rome?* pag. 104.

L. To theſe wiſe Queſtions I anſwer, that neither any particular Church, nor *Catholicks* in General were call'd *Roman Catholicks* before there were *Chriſtians* at *Rome:* nor had they that Denomination generally given them till after ſome Ages: and 'tis impertinent to ask how a Name was loſt or tranſlated before it was given. But are we diſputing about *Names* or *Things?* If St *Peter* had fix'd his *See* immoveably at *Antioch*, and not tranſlated it to *Rome:* and if *Antioch* had always been the *Epiſcopal Seat* of his Succeſſors, it might have happen'd, that in Proceſs of Time the *diffuſive Body of Chriſtians* in Communion with the *Succeſſors* of St *Peter* would have been call'd the *Antiochean* inſtead of *Roman Catholick Church.* But would a difference of Name have made any difference in the eſſential Frame, or Conſtitution of the Church? Really, Sr, you are put to hard ſhifts, when you are forced to lay a Streſs upon, and give an Air of Importance to ſuch a wretched Argument as this. Viz. *The Catholick Church was not always call'd Roman*, ergo, *the Roman Catholick Church is not the Catholick Church abſolutely.*

G. My Lord, every Church, and every Member of it may be call'd *Catholick*, as being included in the general Notion of the *Catholick Church.* But in the ſenſe you have mention'd as *Head* and *Principle* of *Unity* to all Churches, no *Biſhop* or *Church* ever had it till taken up in latter Times by the *Biſhop of Rome.* pag. 104.

L. Sr, whenever it may reaſonably be queſtion'd, whether *Julius Caſar* and *Auguſtus* were once Empe-

pors of *Rome*, it will not be then unreaſonable to queſtion, whether the *Biſhop* and *Church of Rome* were own'd by all Antiquity to be the *Head* and *Principle of Unity* to the whole *Catholick Church*. I have fully proved it in the Beginning of our Converſation, and therefore will not trouble you with tedious Repetitions. But as to what you ſay; *that every Church, and every Member of it may be call'd Catholick, as being included in the general Notion of the Catholick Church*, if you ſpeak of ſuch particular Churches or Perſons, as are in the Communion of the *true Catholick Church*, the Thing is true, but nothing to the Purpoſe, unleſs you prove the *Church of England* to be in the Communion of that Church. But it is utterly falſe, if you ſpeak of *Heretical* or *Schiſmatical Churches*, as all new raiſed Communions are, and as I have fully proved your Church to be.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Here the Gentleman *in his* Caſe ſtated *intending to make an Harangue of about five Pages without Interruption, had no Way to introduce it but by Making his* Lordship *ask this notable Queſtion. L.* But how came the Biſhop of Rome to that great Sway, he has long obtain'd in the Church? *To which the* Gentleman *anſwers as follows.*

§. 55.

The Subject of the Supremacy *reſumed, and the* Gentleman's former *Objections againſt it repeated.*

» *G.* IT is very obvious: becauſe *Rome* was the
» *Metropolis* of the Empire, and conſequently

her Bishop must be more conspicuous, than any « other, have more Respect paid him, and more « Applications made to him, especially after the « Emperors were made *Christians.* pag. 104. 105. «

L. If that were the only Reason, why more *Respect* has been paid, and more *Applications* made to the *Bishops of Rome*, it would follow, that more *Respect* should be paid, and more *Applications* made to the *Bishop of London*, which is the *Metropolis* of *England*, than to the *Archbishop of Canterbury*; who I believe will not relish this Sort of Logick. Not but that the Greatness and Dignity of Cities has been an Occasion of Bestowing greater Advantages and Prerogatives, both *Secular* and *Ecclesiastick*, upon their Bishops, than upon Cities of a lower Rank. But neither the Donation of *Princes*, nor Decrees of *Councils* can encrease or lessen the *Divine Right* of Bishops. So that if St *Peter* and his *Successors* had fix'd their Seat in a *Village*, they would have been the same *supreme Governours* of the Church, and their *See* the *Center* of *Unity*, and the *Ecclesiastical Metropolis* as much as now.

G. 'Twas for the Reason I have given, that when « the Seat of the Empire was translated to *Constan-* « *tinople*, the Bishop of that Church took upon him, « and aspired farther to the *universal Supremacy*, but « was opposed by *Gregory the Great* Bishop of *Rome.* « pag. 105. «

L. Sr, the *Seat* of the *Empire* was translated to *Constantinople* by the very first *Christian* Emperor; and it was not till two hundred and fifty Years after, that it's Patriarch, whom St *Gregory* opposed, affected to stile himself *Oecumenical Patriarch* in Relation to the *Eastern Churches*, but he never had the Vanity to aspire to the *Universal Supremacy*, as I have fully proved. §. 9.

» *G.* My Lord, there was no other Conſidera-
» tion in former Times for the *Superiority* of one
» *Biſhop*, or *Church*, but the Secular *Dignity* of the
» *Place*. For which Reaſon the *Patriarch* of *Jeruſa-*
» *lem* (which was unconteſtably the *Mother-Church*
» of all) was poſtponed, and made the loweſt of all
» the *Patriarchs*. pag. 105.

L. Sr, the Secular Dignity of Places was certainly a Conſideration of Weight to the Church to erect them either into *Patriarchal*, *Metropolitan*, *Archiepiſcopal*, or *Epiſcopal* Sees, and allow a larger Extent of Juriſdiction to one *See*, than another. And thus it was that *Jeruſalem*, tho the *Mother-Church* in Age, became inferiour to other Churches leſs ancient than herſelf. For all this depends upon *human Inſtitution*, and is liable to Change. But *Divine Right* is unalterable, nor is it appropriated to *Places* but *Perſons*. And therefore St *Peter's* Authority, and that of his *Succeſſors* is not Owing to the Majeſty of the City, where they reſide, but to the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, which is not ſubject to Change.

» *G.* My Lord, for *Divine Right*, and *Chriſt* ha-
» ving named one *Biſhop* or *Church* as *Head*, and Su-
» periour to all others, there is not a Word. And
» it could not be *Rome*, before *Rome* was *Chriſtian*.
» And *Chriſt* never named her upon any Occaſion
» whatſoever, or gave the leaſt Hint towards her.
» Strange and unaccountable, if he meant to build
» the whole *Chriſtian Faith* upon her, and to make
» her the *Catholick Church*, as including all other
» Churches of Chriſtians, and in all Ages through-
» out the whole World. *pag.* 105.

L. Sr, it is much more ſtrange and unaccountable, that a Man of your Learning can argue thus with a ſerious Countenance. For (as I have already told you ſeveral Times) *Chriſt* did not veſt *Power*

but *Perſons* with Authority; and St *Peter* was the Man he named; and I cannot think it either ſtrange or unaccountable that St *Peter* ſhould choſe *Rome* for his *Epiſcopal See*. So that it is neither here nor there whether *Chriſt* ever named *Rome* or not, ſo he nominated St *Peter*, and did not forbid him to make *Rome* his *Epiſcopal See*. *Chriſt* therefore made St *Peter* the *Head* of his Church; but did not appoint him *Rome*, or any other Place for his Reſidence. This was left to his own Choice, and he choſe *Rome*, as the whole Current of Antiquity teſtifies: and to doubt of it is the ſame Abſurdity as to doubt, whether that City ever was the *Metropolis* of the *Empire*. But I ſhould be glad to know who ever was ſo ridiculous as to ſay, that the *City* of *Rome includes all other Churches of Chriſtians*.

G. But, My Lord, *Fact*, as I have ſaid before, is the ſureſt Way to give us a true Light of Things. And the Frame or Government of the Church is a Fact, which muſt be examined by Hiſtories and Records, and not Criticiſing upon Words, which afford no Certainty. Let us look therefore into the Frame of the Church from the Beginning. I hope I have made it plain from the Hiſtory of the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*, that there was none of them appointed as *Sovereign* over the others, whatever Words may be ſtrain'd in Favour of St *Peter*. pag. 105. 106.

L. That is to ſay, tho the Words of *Chriſt* be never ſo plain, and the Judgment of Antiquity be unconteſtably in Favour of St *Peter*, you are reſolved he ſhall be degraded, becauſe St *Luke* do's not tell us in expreſs Terms, that he *preſided* in the Council of *Jeruſalem*. However you are forced to give a ridiculous Name to Truth, to make falſehood go down. If therefore inſtead of *Sovereign* you would be

pleaſed to ſay *Head* or *Governour* over the others, the Hope you ſpeak of will appear vain and groundleſs to any one, who knows what I anſwer'd §. 6. to your Objection from the Hiſtory of the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*.

» *G.* My Lord, if St *Peter* was call'd a *Rock*, or » *Foundation*, ſo were all the others. They are call'd » the 12 *Foundations* of the Church. *Rev.* 21. ℣. 14. » Which is ſaid *to be built upon the Foundation of the* » *Apoſtles and Prophets*, *Jeſus-Chriſt himſelf being the* » *chief Corner-Stone*. Eph. 2. ℣. 20. And not any par» ticular *Apoſtle* or *Prophet*. And if the *Keys* of *Hea*» *ven* were promiſed to *Peter*. Math. 16. ℣. 19. This » was fulfill'd in giving them to him jointly with all » the others, without any Mark of Superiority in » him. As in the Commiſſion to *teach all Nations*, it » was equal to them all. And we find in Fact, that » it was exerciſed by them all with equal Authority; » pag. 106.

L. Sr, all this has been fully anſwer'd in our firſt Diſpute concerning the *Supremacy*, where I told you that the *Apoſtles* conſider'd preciſely as *Doctors* or *Teachers* were all equal, and independent of one another. For as they all had their *Inſpiration* immediately from God, and were no leſs *infallible* than St *Peter*, they could not depend on him as their *Doctor* teaching them the Myſteries of *Chriſtian Faith*. And ſo their Commiſſion *to teach all Nations* was likewiſe equal to them all, becauſe all this belong'd to them as *Teachers*. But the *ſupreme Government* of the Church was promiſed to St *Peter alone*, when *Chriſt* told him, *alone* Math. 16. ℣. 19. *That he would build his Church upon him:* as all the ancient Fathers underſtood that Text. If therefore *Chriſt* kept his Word, the whole Church is built upon St *Peter* in a *particular Manner*. And ſince the *Apoſtles* were ſurely a Part of the Church,

Church, they were likewiſe built upon St *Peter*. But they were not built upon him as their *Doctor*, therefore as their *ſupreme Governour*. Now, Sr, you may go on, if you pleaſe.

G. All the Regimen of the Church, which the « *Apoſtles* appointed was that of *Biſhops* in their ſe- « veral Diſtricts, without any *Head* or *Sovereign* « *Biſhop* over them all as ſupreme Judge of Contro- « verſy. *pag.* 106. «

L. Sr, there was no Neceſſity for the *Apoſtles* to appoint a *Head*, ſince *Chriſt* himſelf had done it for them. But I preſume the *Apoſtles* did not pretend to undo, what *Chriſt* had done, or oblige St *Peter* to abdicate in Order to make Way for a Church of *Independents* without a *Head*.

G. There is not the leaſt Tittle of this [*Head*] « to be found in any of the Hiſtories, or Writings « of thoſe Ages after the Apoſtles: tho there were « many Controverſies even in Faith amongſt them, « which an Appeal to this Judge had ſpeedily ended. « But no ſuch Thing appears, which could not have « been miſs'd, had it been known. *pag.* 106. 107. «

L. Thoſe, Sr, who have Eyes to read, will find in the Hiſtories and Writings of Antiquity, that the Church never was without a Head; provided they have but ſome Grains of Sincerity to own what they read, and underſtand. But, tho the Fact be unconteſtable, there is one very good Reaſon, why Controverſies even in Faith were not always ended in the primitive Ages any more, than in aftertimes. And the Reaſon is, becauſe there have been true *Hereticks* in all Ages. And theſe, like our modern *Proteſtants* never were of an Humour to ſubmit to lawful Authority. Have you any Thing more to ſay?

G. Yes, My Lord, I have ſomething to ſay con- «

» cerning the ancient Conſtitution of the Church. » *Metropolitans* were early, that is, the Bishop of » the *Metropolis*, or Chief City of a Province, who » preſided in the Synods of that Province, and had » other Eccleſiaſtical Priviledges granted him by the » common Conſent of the Bishops of the Place for » Order ſake, and greater Harmony of Diſcipline. » But a *Patriarch* with Juriſdiction over ſeveral *Me-* » *tropolitans* or Provinces was never heard of in the » Church till the Council of *Calcedon* An. 450. And » many Provinces were not put under theſe *Patri-* » *archs*, but had exempt Juriſdictions of their own as » before: of which *Britain* was one. For the *Patriar-* » *chat* of *Rome* extended only to *Italy*, and the Iſles » adjacent. *pag.* 107.

L. Sr, the Pope claims not his Juriſdiction over the whole Church either as *Biſhop* of the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, or as *Patriarch* of the *Weſt*, but preciſely as *Succeſſor* of St *Peter*, and by Conſequence, the *Vicar* of *Chriſt* upon Earth. This he has by *Divine Inſtitution*. This is his unalterable and unalienable Right. So that I cannot imagine, what it is to our Purpoſe to know, when *Patriarchs* or *Metropolitans* were firſt inſtituted any more, than when Towns were firſt divided into *Parishes*. For whether this was done ſoon or late; or whether their Juriſdiction was of a large or narrow Extent: or whether ſome Towns or Provinces had a Juriſdiction independent of their *Patriarchs* or *Metropolitans* after they were inſtituted; All this has no Manner of Connection with the *Supremacy* either of St *Peter*, or his *Succeſſors*: and you may as well make the Inſtituting of *Lords-Lieutenants* of Counties, or *Governors* of Cities an Objection againſt the *Sovereignty* of the Crown of *Great Britain*.

» *G.* My Lord, the firſt Pretence to *univerſal Su-*

premacy was ſet up by *John* Bishop of *Conſtanti-* «
nople after the Seat of the Empire was tranſlated » thither. Againſt whom *Gregory* the *Great* wrote, « and ſaid, that tho the *See* of *Rome* had always the « Precedence of *Conſtantinople*, yet that none of his « Predeceſſors the Bishops of *Rome* had ever aſſumed « ſuch an arrogant Title, which he calls a *Luciferian* « Pride, and declares him, who should take it, to « be the Forerunner of *Antichriſt*. pag. 107. «

L. Sr, I have fully anſwer'd this frivolous Objection, §. 9. And pray remember what I then both ſaid and proved; *viz.* that no Pope ever maintain'd the *ſpiritual Supremacy* more vigorouſly both in *Words* and *Facts* than *Gregory the Great:* tho he had the Humility to ſtile himſelf *the Servant of the Servants of God.*

G. Yet, My Lord, his next Succeſſor but one, « that is, *Boniface* the 3d took it being given him by « *Phocas* that Traitor and Uſurper, who murder'd « his Maſter *Mauritius* the Emperor, and ſeiz'd his « Throne; whom *Boniface* own'd and abetted, and « was made univerſal Bishop for his Reward in the « Beginning of the 7th Century. Thus the *Supremacy* « now claim'd by *Rome* was introduced, and has been « maintain'd *pro viribus* ever ſince. And under this « *Britain* has been ſubdued, which never was under « the *Patriarchat* of *Rome*. So much has the Govern- « ment and Unity of the Church been alter'd from « what it was in the Time of the *Apoſtles*, or in the « firſt Ages of the Church. And thus has *Rome* uſur- « ped the Name of the *Catholick Church*, and placed « all it's *Unity* in Submiſſion to her Bishop. Here « we ſee the Degrees, by which this Encroachment « crept on. The *Patriarchats* began in the 5th, and « the *univerſal Supremacy* in the 7th Century. And « *Britain*, which held it out againſt the *Patriarchat* «

» of *Rome*, was at laſt conquer'd by the more appa-
» rent Uſurpation of her *univerſal Supremacy*, ſo ob-
» tain'd as I told you. *pag.* 107. 108.

L. As you have told me indeed, but with the ſame Ground of Truth, as a Man tells a Fable or Romance. I muſt own you have here given me a moſt ample Proof of your Skill in Miſrepreſenting and Diſfiguring hiſtorical Facts. For who would not conclude from the Account you give of *Boniface* the 3d, that he was an Accomplice in the Murder of *Mauritius*, and a Promoter of *Phocas's* Uſurpation? Whereas that Tyrant murder'd his Maſter, and invaded the Imperial Throne during the Pontificat of *Gregory the Great*, and *Boniface* was not made Pope till the 4th Year of *Phocas's* Reign. 'Tis therefore both falſe and malicious to ſay, *that he was made Univerſal Biſhop in Reward for Owning and Abbetting that wicked Murder.* 'Tis true he own'd *Phocas* for Emperor, and ſo did his two Predeceſſors *Sabinus* and *Gregory the Great*, who even ſent a *Nuncio* to reſide at *Conſtantinople*. For it was not the Pope's Buſineſs to diſpute the Lawfulneſs of an *elective Title* with the Poſſeſſor of it, tho he had obtain'd it by the moſt wicked Means.

2*dly*, 'tis a noted Falſehood, that the Pope's *Supremacy* was introduced by *Boniface*. For if he had introduced it, no Pope before him could have claim'd it; which is contrary to innumerable hiſtorical Facts, and the whole Current of Antiquity; as I have fully proved, §. 3. 9. 10. 16. &c. The only Difference therefore between Pope *Boniface*, and his Predeceſſors is this. *Viz.* That he prevail'd with *Phocas* to deprive *Cyriacus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* of the vain and pompous Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch*, and accepted it himſelf. But he accepted it not in the Senſe, in which St *Gregory* had underſtood and oppoſed it

in *John* of *Conſtantinople*, but only in the ſame Senſe, as it had before been offer'd to St *Leo* by the *Council of Calcedon*, [*Conc. Calced.* Act. 3.] which Council is allow'd off by your own Church. But was not Pope *Leo* a hundred and fifty Years before *Boniface* 3d. And all Men of Learning know how vigorouſly he aſſerted the *Supremacy* of his *See*. 'Tis therefore a notorious Falſehood that it was firſt introduced by *Boniface*.

3*dly*, 'tis falſe that any Part of the *eſſential* Frame or Government of the Church has been changed ſince the Time of the *Apoſtles*. And

4*thly*, 'tis both falſe and a Blunder to ſay, that *Rome* has uſurped the Name of the *Catholick Church*. *Rome* is indeed the *Head-Church*, but it muſt be a Head without Brains to call itſelf the *whole Body*. As it muſt likewiſe be a *Head* without Authority (which is the ſame *Chimera* as a *Head*, and no Head) if a rational Obedience and Submiſſion be not due to it.

Thus, Sr, we ſee what Credit is to be given to Perſons prejudiced as you are. Yet the deluded People depend upon you, and take every Thing you ſay upon Truſt, eſpecially when it is deliver'd with a Poſitiveneſs and Confidence, which takes away all ſuſpicion of inſincere Dealing.

G. My Lord, I have heard ſome *Britains* ſay, « that tho they thought the *Church of Rome* the moſt « corrupt Part of the *Chriſtian Church* both as to Doc- « trine and Worſhip, and to be a Cage full of un- « clean Birds, yet that they muſt be of her, and « enter into that Cage, becauſe she was the *Catholick* « *Church*. This is like that deſperate Maxim in the « *Canon-Law* I quoted before out of the *Decretals*: « that tho the Pope ſhould draw infinite Numbers of « People with him into Hell, yet we muſt not find « Fault with him, nor reprove him. pag. 108. «

L. Sr, after what I have ſaid, §. 47. to ſhew how you have mangled and miſrepreſented the Senſe of that *Canon*, you muſt have a good Stock of Aſſurance to repeat it. But as to what you ſay concerning *ſome Britains*, I preſume thoſe noble *Britains* had their Lodging in *More-Fields*: And 'tis to that learned Academy I refer you for an Explanation of their Meaning.

» *G.* But, My Lord, I muſt alſo obſerve here, » that tho *France* has thrown off the *Pope's Infallibi-* » *lity*, and his *depoſing Power* over Princes, and has » limited his *Supremacy*, that is indeed, taken it » wholly away; for no *Supremacy*, properly ſo call'd, » can be limited, for then it ceaſes to be *Supreme:* » yet *France* remains ſtill in the Dreggs of the Cor- » ruptions of *Rome* both as to *Doctrine* and *Worſhip.* » The Religion of the People there, is the *Adora-* » *tion* of the *Hoſt*, and of the *Croſs*, *Invocation of Saints*, » *Worſhip of Images*, Praying Souls out of *Purgatory*, » telling their *Beads*, and Going to *Confeſſion.* pag. » 109.

L. Which I adviſe you as a Friend to do: And if you will be ſo kind to yourſelf as to follow my Advice, pray, Sr, forget not to examine yourſelf well upon the Articles of *Miſrepreſentation*, *Falſehoods*, and *Slander*. For they are moſt damnable Sins, and oblige to Retractation, and Reparation of Honour.

But you have here broach'd ſo much fresh Matter, that I muſt crave your Leave to reſerve the Examination of it to another Meeting. For I am pretty well tired with this Day's Work, the chief Burden whereof has laid upon me. You have aſſerted a great deal, and proved little or nothing: Whereas the Drudgery both of Proving and Diſproving has been continually my Task. I ſhall only add a Word

or two relating to your Obſervation concerning *France*, and ſo take my Leave of you for this Time.

I deſire you therefore to obſerve, that the Pope's *Infallibility* and *Depoſing Power* are no Articles of our Faith, as I have often told you: And ſo 'tis nothing to the Purpoſe, whether *France* has thrown them off or not. But I cannot imagine what you mean in Saying, *that a Power ceaſes to be ſupreme, when it is limited.* Pray, Sr, can there be no *Sovereign Prince*, which is even more than *Supreme*, unleſs he be *arbitrary* and deſpotick in his Dominions? Is not every Prince bound to govern his Subjects according to *Law?* And are not thoſe Laws made to *limit* the Exerciſe of his Power? 'Tis therefore abſurd to ſay, that a Power ceaſes to be *Supreme*, when it is limited. I think the Kings of *Great Britain* are *Supreme*, nay *Sovereigns* in their Dominions: and yet their Power is limited by the *magna Charta.* And ſo it is with the Pope. For tho he be the *ſupreme Governour* of the Church, he is bound to govern according to the *Canons* of *General Councils*; as the *Council* of *Florence* expreſſes itſelf. And this is all the Limitation of the Pope's *Supremacy* you will find in *France.* So that if *France* remains ſtill *in the Dreggs of the Corruptions of Rome* (as you are pleaſed to call them) both as to *Doctrine* and *Worſhip*, it follows evidently, that *France* has not thrown off the Pope's *ſpiritual Supremacy*, which you know very well is an *Article of Faith* in the *Church of Rome*: And the Belief of it is required as a *neceſſary Condition of Communion.*

The End of the firſt Part.